

By Mr. SANDERS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 15119) for the relief of William Mathew Squires; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER: A bill (H. R. 15120) granting an increase of pension to Emily L. Hagen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 15121) granting a pension to Julian D. Haynes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SPEAKS: A bill (H. R. 15122) granting an increase of pension to George E. Partee; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 15123) granting an increase of pension to Julia Hallowell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 15124) granting an increase of pension to Anna P. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 15125) granting a pension to Hattie L. McDaniel; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15126) granting a pension to Thomas J. Orr; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHITTINGTON: A bill (H. R. 15127) granting a pension to Mrs. Ethel B. Sutherland; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15128) granting a pension to Edward Forte; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOODRUFF: A bill (H. R. 15129) granting a pension to Ruth L. Retan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KERR: Resolution (H. Res. 318) to pay Frances Slade, widow of Charles Slade, late an employee of the House, six months' compensation and \$250 to defray the funeral expenses of said Charles Slade; to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

7898. By Mr. CONNERY: Resolution of Massachusetts Teachers' Federation, requesting Congress to enact legislation assigning 15 per cent of all radio broadcasting channels to educational institutions and Government educational agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7899. By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Resolution adopted by the board of supervisors of the city and county of San Francisco, to amend the Jones-White Act; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

7900. By Mr. EVANS of California: Petition signed by Jennie M. Knowles and approximately 150 others, in favor of the passage of House Joint Resolution No. 358; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7901. By Mr. FENN: Resolutions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and missionary meeting of Congregational Church, of Wethersfield, Conn., favoring the Federal supervision of motion pictures; to the Committee on Education.

7902. Also, petition of citizens of Hartford and West Hartford, Conn., favoring the passage of House bill 7884, for the exemption of dogs from vivisection in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7903. By Mr. HOUSTON of Hawaii: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Honolulu, Hawaii, favoring the passage of House Resolution No. 11, reported by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on January 27, 1930; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7904. By Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts: Petition of American Federation of Labor, William Green, president, Washington, D. C., urging enactment of legislation providing for the manufacture of war munitions and naval vessels in arsenals and navy yards of the United States, so that the elimination of private profit will place this department of national defense beyond the baleful influence of those who seek to create sentiment for the production of war munitions so that they may make greater profits; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

tions so that they may make greater profits; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

7905. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, favoring certain legislation with reference to the units of the metric system; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

7906. By Mr. O'CONNOR of New York: Resolution of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, urging adoption of the units of the metric system as the sole legal standard of weights and measures throughout the United States; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

7907. By Mr. HARCOURT J. PRATT: Memorial of Columbia County (N. Y.) Historical Society, advocating Government acquisition of the land in the town of New Windsor, Orange County, N. Y., which was the camp ground of the American Army in 1782 and 1783, for the establishment thereon of a national park, and the erection of a perpetual memorial to George Washington in the form of reproduction of the camp building known as the Temple of Virtue; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

7908. By Mr. ROBINSON: Petition of Cedar Falls, Iowa, branch of the American Association of University Women, signed by about 50 members in support of House bill 9986; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7909. By Mr. WHITTINGTON: Petition of board of supervisors of Bolivar County, Miss., for extension of emergency freight rates in drought area; to the Committee on Interstate Foreign Commerce.

7910. By Mr. WYANT: Resolution of members of Irwin Aerie, Fraternal Order of Eagles, Irwin, Pa., offering program of unemployment relief; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7911. Also, petition of 500 members of the Wilkesburg Woman's Christian Temperance Union, requesting support of House bill 9986; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7912. Also, petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Greensburg, Pa., urging support of Hudson bill (H. R. 9986) and Brookhart bill (S. 1005), regulating production and distribution of moving-picture films; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

MONDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1930

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hast created all things for Thyself, and through Thy Son, Jesus Christ, hast summoned us to share in Thy redemptive plan, lead us past the barriers of fear to the furnace of flaming purity where all falsehood, sin, and cowardice, like dross, are purged away. Give to our work qualities instinct with life, by which alone our actions bear the unforgeable impress of our personality and we retain our sense of the dignity of humble toil, the value of life's daily ministries.

Grant that we may look out upon the world with our own eyes—the eyes wherewith we saw the Christ and were made glad—till the common path becomes a shining trail whose end is God, where we walk in blest communion with our fellow men. So fit us for the day's most pressing needs, we dare not ask for less; and whatsoever else Thou knowest we should have, bestow it in Thy love. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Friday last, when, on request of Mr. Fess and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

SHORTER WORK WEEK FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 6603) to provide a shorter work week for postal employees, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Under the rule of the Senate it would be possible to secure the placing of this bill on the calendar without a reference to the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct, under Rule XIV.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. However, I have discussed the matter with the chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads [Mr. PHIPPS] and he assures me that the committee will meet immediately to consider it and will submit a report thereon so that the Senate may dispose of the measure. Therefore I am willing to have it take the regular course and go to the committee.

Mr. PHIPPS. I will say to the Senator that I shall call the committee together as early as possible.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

CREDENTIALS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the credentials of M. M. LOGAN, chosen a Senator from the State of Kentucky for the term commencing March 4, 1931, which were read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY,
Frankfort, Ky., November 24, 1930.

The undersigned, a board for examining the returns of an election held on Tuesday, the 4th day of November, 1930, for the office of United States Senator of the State of Kentucky, do certify that M. M. LOGAN received the highest number of votes given for that office, as certified to the secretary of state, and is, therefore, duly and regularly elected for the term prescribed by the Constitution.

W. B. O'CONNELL, Chairman,
D. B. CORNETT, Member,
State Board of Election Commissioners
for the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

Attest:

JOHN P. CUSICK,
Secretary State Board of Election Commissioners.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore also laid before the Senate the credentials of CHARLES L. McNARY, chosen a Senator from the State of Oregon for the term commencing March 4, 1931, which were read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

STATE OF OREGON,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

Know ye, that it appearing from the official canvass of the votes cast at the general election held within and for the State of Oregon on Tuesday, the 4th day of November, A. D. 1930, that CHARLES L. McNARY, of Marion County, State of Oregon, received the highest number of votes cast for the office of United States Senator in Congress at said general election:

Now, therefore, I, A. W. Norblad, Governor of the State of Oregon, by virtue of the authority vested in me under the laws of the State of Oregon, do hereby grant this certificate of election and declare said CHARLES L. McNARY, of Marion County, State of Oregon, to be duly elected to the office of United States Senator in Congress of the State of Oregon for the term of six years.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the State of Oregon to be hereunto affixed.

Done at the Capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 4th day of December, A. D. 1930.

A. W. NORBLAD, Governor.

By the governor:

[SEAL.]

HAL E. HOSS,
Secretary of State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore also laid before the Senate the credentials of W. J. BULOW, chosen a Senator from the State of South Dakota for the term commencing March 4, 1931, which, with the accompanying related papers, were read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

This is to certify that on the 4th day of November, 1930, at a general election held throughout said State, W. J. BULOW was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of South Dakota to the office of United States Senator for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1931.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of said State to be affixed at Pierre, the capital, this 4th day of December, 1930.

By the governor:

[SEAL.]

GLADYS PYLE,
Secretary of State.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

CLERK'S OFFICE,

Washington, D. C., December 13, 1930.

HON. EDWIN P. THAYER,

Secretary of the Senate,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR COLONEL THAYER: Herewith is the certificate of election of Hon. W. J. BULOW, as Senator elect from the State of South Dakota, which was received in this office together with those of the Representatives elect to the Seventy-second Congress; and I am transmitting it to you with a copy of the letter of the secretary of state explanatory of the omission of the governor's signature from the certificate, whom I have advised of this action.

Yours sincerely,

WM. TYLER PAGE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Pierre, December 9, 1930.

WM. TYLER PAGE,

Clerk of House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PAGE: Under separate cover I am mailing you the certificates of election for the Congressmen and Senator from South Dakota.

You will note that Senator BULOW's certificate is signed by myself alone, since under the South Dakota law a man can not take part in the canvass of his own votes, and the present governor is the W. J. BULOW elected to the United States Senate.

Very truly yours,

GLADYS PYLE,
Secretary of State.

THE RHODES SCHOLARSHIPS

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I present a letter from the American secretary of the Rhodes Scholarship Trust. Inasmuch as we had some discussion of this matter recently, this letter, I think, will explain the situation as to the final selection. I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

THE RHODES SCHOLARSHIP TRUST,
SWARTHMORE COLLEGE,
Swarthmore, Pa., December 3, 1930.

HON. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR FLETCHER: I am glad to answer your letter of December 1, in which you ask for information regarding the plan of selecting Rhodes scholars in the United States.

Although the Rhodes scholarships plan has always operated with considerable success in the United States, it has become fairly clear to those intimately associated with the working of the plan over a considerable period of years that not all of the men selected every year were as successful at Oxford, either academically or in other respects, as we would like them to be or as influential, either in large or small communities, upon their return to America. These men were not always selected by the less populous States, but it appeared to us that the general average of Rhodes scholars selected could be considerably improved without at the same time either impairing the chances of smaller States, if they had good men to submit, or violating the spirit of Cecil Rhodes's plan, as interpreted by those who knew him and his point of view personally.

Consequently, with the approval of Parliament, and most of the leading educational organizations and individuals in America, a district plan of election will go into effect on a trial basis this year. Under the old plan each State selected a Rhodes scholar in two out of three years. The selection was made by a State committee appointed through this office and approved by the Rhodes trustees.

Under the new plan each State has a chance every year, since the State committee selects two candidates and nominates them to appear before a district committee. The district includes 6 States, and, consequently, the committee has before it 12 candidates, two from each State. From these 12 candidates the district committee selects four as Rhodes scholars to represent the district and their respective States. If the smaller or less populous States submit good candidates to the district committee, it is very unlikely that they will be left out in the elections, and certainly it would be against the interests of the district committees themselves to allow one or more populous States in a district to carry away the whole election.

Since, under the old plan a candidate could apply to the State in which he claimed residence, even though he had been educated elsewhere, the idea of a State being represented at Oxford had become a vague one. In some respects it should be less vague under the new plan.

The inclosed memorandum will give you all the facts of selection for Rhodes scholars this year. The third district, as you will see, consists of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, and Tennessee. Any man who conforms to the conditions of eligibility given in paragraph 2 of the inclosed

memorandum may apply to one of those States. The State committee in each of these States, after a careful consideration and comparison of the credentials of the candidates, meets all the more likely candidates for a personal interview on December 6. There are no examinations. The State committee then nominates two men to appear before the district committee—a very carefully selected group consisting of four prominent former Rhodes scholars and one man from the district not a Rhodes scholar, outstanding in public affairs. The committee for District III meets in Atlanta December 10 and 11 and will select four Rhodes scholars. You will note that the more populous States in District II are also entitled to only four Rhodes scholars.

We have found it advisable not to broadcast the names and addresses of committeemen too much in advance of their meetings, since in that case they are likely to be troubled by many well meaning advocates of the various candidates.

This new plan of district election is on trial for a period of a few years. If after a fair trial it does not prove successful, we will return to the old plan or adopt some other after discussion.

Yours sincerely,

FRANK AYDELOTTE.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. FLETCHER presented the petition of Hamilton Holt, president, and members of the faculty of Rollins College, Winter Park, Fla., praying for the ratification of the World Court protocols, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Third Biennial Conference of the American Unitarian Association at Chicago, Ill., favoring the ratification of the World Court protocols, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a resolution adopted at a meeting of 150 citizens, being farmers and growers of vegetables and other crops at Winter Beach, Indian River County, Fla., favoring a "congressional investigation of the existing situation wherein the grower receives nothing for his products, yet the consumer pays high prices for the same products," etc., which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented resolutions adopted at a meeting of 150 citizens of Winter Beach, Indian River County, Fla., requesting the Department of Agriculture to rescind the order issued under date of November 10, 1930, by the Farmers' Seed Loan Office of Columbia, S. C., relative to loans in 1930 for the purpose of crop production during the 1930-31 crop season (said loans being due and payable on the 31st day of May, 1931, and the aggregate amount of all loans so made to growers in Winter Beach, Fla., being the sum of \$6,540) and to permit the growers to have until the maturity date of their loans, namely, May 31, 1931, in which to pay the sums advanced by the Government, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. CAPPER presented petitions numerously signed by sundry citizens of Stevens County, Kans., praying for the passage of legislation to strengthen the national prohibition laws and protesting against the passage of legislation weakening the enforcement of the so-called dry laws, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FESS presented a resolution adopted by representatives of 37 posts of the American Legion, composing the fourth district of the Department of Ohio, at Mariemont, Ohio, favoring the passage of legislation for the erection in southwestern Ohio of a 500-bed hospital, a 50-bed diagnostic center, and ample housing for the regional office of the United States Veterans' Bureau, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GILLET presented a resolution adopted at the Twenty-seventh Annual Meeting of the Massachusetts Federation of Churches (Inc.) in All Souls Federated Church, Lowell, Mass., urging the prompt ratification of the World Court protocols, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. TYDINGS presented a petition of sundry members of the Young Woman's Christian Association, of Baltimore, Md., praying for the ratification of the World Court protocols, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens and employees of the post office at Bel Air, Md., praying for the passage of House bill 6603, being the so-called Kendall

shorter week work bill, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry employees of the Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, praying if the bill (S. 5100) to provide a 5-day week for Government employees during the economic emergency (introduced by Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts) be considered that a clause be inserted therein whereby per diem employees be put on a per annum basis or that their salaries be raised proportionately, so as to prevent loss of pay, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

PRICE OF COTTON

Mr. GEORGE presented a telegram from John A. Manget, of Atlanta, Ga., which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATLANTA, Ga., December 15, 1930.

Senator WALTER F. GEORGE.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Notwithstanding fact Farm Board has pegged price wheat it continues to allow cotton decline almost daily, resulting in widespread economic distress in Georgia. Unless relief is obtained speedily impending ruin will be upon us. Can not you prevail on Farm Board to show same consideration for cotton it has shown wheat? Conclusive evidence that Farm Board is deeply concerned regarding this impending catastrophe would bring immediate results, then if board would follow to the extent it has helped wheat it would save further distress. This is appeal for help, not criticism of board, to which my sympathy goes and for its personnel have highest regard. Am not personally interested in even one bale cotton, but in daily contact with thousands Georgians suffering because cotton bringing only half cost production, therefore urging you and Senator HARRIS take drastic steps bring relief to your fellow citizens. If can assist any way, call me long distance or will cheerfully come to Washington.

Gratefully yours,

JNO. A. MANGET.

REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. SHEPPARD, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3122) for the relief of William J. Frost, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1177) thereon.

Mr. REED, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6618) to provide for the study, investigation, and survey, for commemorative purposes, of the battlefield of Chalmette, La., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1178) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 4619) to authorize the disposition of effects of persons dying while subject to military law, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1179) thereon.

Mr. BLACK, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 1036) for the relief of Homer N. Horine, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1180) thereon.

REPORTS OF NOMINATIONS

As in executive session,

Mr. PHIPPS, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably sundry post-office nominations.

Mr. HALE, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, reported favorably the nomination of Brig. Gen. Ben H. Fuller to be the Major General Commandant of the Marine Corps for a period of four years, and also the nominations of sundry other officers of the Marine Corps.

Mr. COUZENS, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, reported favorably the nominations of the following persons to be members of the Federal Power Commission:

Claude L. Draper, of Wyoming, for the term expiring June 22, 1931;

Marcel Garsaud, of Louisiana, for the term expiring June 22, 1932;

Ralph B. Williamson, of Washington, for the term expiring June 22, 1933; and

George Otis Smith, of Maine, for the term expiring June 22, 1935.

Mr. COUZENS also, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, reported favorably the nominations of Charles

D. Mahaffie, of the District of Columbia, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term expiring December 31, 1930, and also for the term expiring December 31, 1937.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVIS:

A bill (S. 5309) providing an annual salary for certain criers and bailiffs of United States district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANSDELL:

A bill (S. 5310) authorizing Edwin B. Kirwin to accept a decoration from the French Government; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. TRAMMELL:

A bill (S. 5311) providing for a reduction in the rate of postage on grove and farm products; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 5312) to establish an agricultural experiment station in Florida; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

A bill (S. 5313) to cancel certain reimbursable charges against certain lands within the Gila River Indian Reservation, Ariz.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 5314) to amend the Federal highway act; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 5315) granting an increase of pension to Nicolas Lopes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOSES:

A bill (S. 5316) granting an increase of pension to Emma E. Bennett; and

A bill (S. 5317) granting an increase of pension to Louisa A. Cleveland; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROCK:

A bill (S. 5318) to extend the time in which applications may be made for the benefit of the disabled emergency officers' retirement act of May 24, 1928; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 5319) to grant the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of the State of Tennessee to construct a bridge across the French Broad River on the proposed Morristown-Newport Road between Jefferson and Cocke Counties, Tenn.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 5320) for the relief of Ralph Hart; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SWANSON:

A bill (S. 5321) for the relief of Thomas F. Myers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 5322) to amend an act approved February 24, 1925, entitled "An act to provide for the construction of a memorial bridge across the Potomac River from a point near the Lincoln Memorial, in the city of Washington, to an appropriate point in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GILLET:

A bill (S. 5323) to authorize Rear Admiral Sumner E. W. Kittelle, United States Navy, to accept a decoration conferred upon him by the Government of Spain; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 5324) to correct the military record of Peter Cormier (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 5325) granting an increase of pension to Fannie A. Knowles (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHORTRIDGE:

A bill (S. 5326) for the relief of William J. Dillon; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 5327) granting a pension to Talbert Shalen O'Brien; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 5328) for the relief of Charles P. Dinger; and

A bill (S. 5329) for the relief of Frank Knighthart; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana:

A bill (S. 5330) granting an increase of pension to Sarah S. Ward (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5331) granting an increase of pension to William R. Holt (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

A bill (S. 5332) for the relief of Fanny M. Crosby (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 5333) granting a pension to Ernest M. Brazil (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5334) granting a pension to Susan M. Jones Jayne (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5335) granting a pension to Samantha C. Glass (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 5336) granting an increase of pension to Nora Ernst (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5337) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth May (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5338) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Woodworth (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 5339) to authorize the widening of Thirteenth Street NW., in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 5340) for the relief of Edwin Rodman; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 5341) to provide for the payment of architect's fees other than on a percentage basis in certain cases; and

A bill (S. 5342) to provide for the selection of sites for public buildings outside of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BARKLEY:

A bill (S. 5343) granting a pension to Mary E. Tilford; and

A bill (S. 5344) granting a pension to Synthia Travis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GEORGE:

A bill (S. 5345) granting a pension to Polk W. Nunnally; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 5346) granting an increase of pension to John Steffes; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 5347) providing for the deepening of channel and harbor of port of St. Petersburg, Fla., as provided in Senate Document No. 229, Seventieth Congress, and Public No. 520, Seventy-first Congress; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. PHIPPS:

A bill (S. 5348) to authorize appropriations for construction of additional hospital facilities at Fitzsimons General Hospital, Denver, Colo., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRATTON:

A bill (S. 5349) to convey certain lands in San Juan County, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. WAGNER:

A bill (S. 5350) to amend the revenue act of 1928 in regard to unemployment relief trusts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 5351) authorizing the President to appoint Mortimer J. Israel, formerly a first lieutenant of Infantry, Organized Reserves, a first lieutenant of Infantry, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 5352) to amend the act of March 4, 1911 (ch. 239, 36 Stat. L. 1267), as amended; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BLACK:

A bill (S. 5353) for the relief of Mrs. Herman M. Warr; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REED:

A bill (S. 5354) to repeal obsolete parts of statutes relating to detachments at the United States Military Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DENEEN:

A bill (S. 5355) granting a pension to Alice Simpson (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5356) granting an increase of pension to George Slifer (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A bill (S. 5357) granting a pension to Fannie Carroll (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5358) granting a pension to Emory Leonard Downey (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER:

A bill (S. 5359) granting an increase of pension to James Stuart; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAWES:

A bill (S. 5360) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 5361) granting an increase of pension to Jackson St. John (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

A bill (S. 5362) authorizing the payment of a pension of \$40 per month to all persons who have served 20 years or more as members of the Indian police at any agency in the United States of America; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. NORBECK:

A bill (S. 5363) granting a pension to Wesley S. Walden (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FRAZIER (by request):

A bill (S. 5364) to reserve 440 acres of public domain land for addition to the Temecula or Pechanga Reservation, Calif.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. METCALF:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 219) authorizing the Director of the Census to prepare and transmit to the several States lists of persons shown by the census of 1930 to be illiterate; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

AMENDMENT TO TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. SMOOT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 14246, the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill, which was, on page 37, line 22, before the period, to insert a comma and the words "to be immediately available," so as to read:

For the acquisition of sites or of additional land, commencement, continuation, or completion, of construction in connection with any or all projects authorized under the provisions of sections 3 and 5 of the public buildings act, approved May 25, 1926 (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 40, secs. 343, 345), and the acts amendatory thereof, approved February 24, 1928 (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 40, sec. 345), and March 31, 1930 (46 Stat., pp. 136, 137), within the respective limits of cost fixed for such projects, \$60,000,000, to be immediately available.

RUSSIA—EDITORIAL FROM THE LONDON OBSERVER

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I desire to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial on Russia from the London Observer written by J. L. Garvin.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The editorial is as follows:

Without the inclusion of Russia in a larger league it is obvious—every competent authority at Geneva admits it—that there can be no assurance of stability either in Russia or Asia. What we here insist on calling the Soviet empire—though the Bolsheviks hate that true term—stretches like the czardom across two continents, from the Baltic to the Pacific. This huge block of the globe is like an erratic mass of magnetic iron disturbing all the compasses. For the soviet territory touches a far larger number of nations than does any other realm or republic whatever. For thousands and thousands of miles the confines of Russia swing

round through every variety of geographical region, from Central Europe to the Farthest East; they border or closely neighbor Scandinavia and all the four new Baltic states; Germany, Poland, and Czechoslovakia; Hungary and the Balkans; Turkey, Persia, Afghanistan, India; China and Japan.

We beg the bankers, British and American, to reflect more deeply upon the world-wide connection between the political and economic interests. Bolshevik propaganda from Berlin and Canton is, of course, only stimulated and strengthened by blank refusals to enter into any sort of working terms with Moscow. Owing to the unexampled misgovernment, stupidity, and infatuation of the czardom itself, the Russian revolution broke the rotten dams seven years ago and rushed out in an obliterating flood. But the thing, for all its horror and madness in the outbreak, has happened. You can never reverse it. The Bolsheviks, like the French terrorists after 1793, will have to restore a great deal of private liberty and capitalist enterprise. That is what nothing on earth can prevent. The Bolshevik system will give way to some less abnormal régime, but that must be left to Russia and to time; and meanwhile the less foreign abuse and prodding and goading, the better. If we are wise, we shall encourage the saner elements who are feeling their way back to practical relations with the West, instead of playing once more into the hands of the extreme incorrigible bedlamites in Moscow. * * * Lord Cecil recognizes that without the participation of the Soviet empire in a general scheme of settlement there can be no increase of security in Europe or Asia, and no real advance toward real disarmament. (Editorial by J. L. Garvin, the London Observer.)

ADDRESS BY HON. JOSEPH B. EASTMAN, OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Joseph B. Eastman, of the Interstate Commerce Commission, before the Associated Industries of Massachusetts, at Boston, on October 23, 1930, on the subject of rates and regulation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The address is as follows:

RATES AND REGULATION

The title which I have chosen for this address is not in itself, I am afraid, very illuminating. The subject is one on which the commission of which I am a member has already published some 150 or so large volumes, and the end of the series is not yet in sight. It may prove to be a case of perpetual motion. Nor are we the only ones engaged in the mass production of such literature. I shall not, therefore, attempt to burden you with all that may be said upon the subject, but shall confine my remarks to a few observations upon matters which I believe have elements of general interest and present importance. These observations will first touch upon certain matters which have a bearing upon the public regulation of rates generally, including utility as well as railroad rates. Before I finish, however, I shall have something to say specifically about the regulation of freight rates, in which you are more particularly interested.

While hardly necessary, it may be well to say at the outset that I speak for myself alone and that my colleagues on the commission are not to be held in any wise responsible for my remarks. They may agree or they may not; I have not undertaken to find out. It may be well to say, also, that for the future I reserve the right and recognize the duty to change my mind upon any of the matters discussed, to the extent that it may be shown that my present views are wrong. Nothing of the sort is, of course, anticipated.

I shall do my best to talk to you upon these matters quite frankly. Experience in public service has given me two abiding convictions, among others. One is that a public servant who is in a position to talk at all ought to say precisely what is in his mind, with due regard for courtesy and tact. The other is that the public ought to say precisely what is in their minds with respect to their servants, with less regard, perhaps, for courtesy and tact. Intellectual dishonesty is the bane of our political life. It probably ranks higher in this respect than financial dishonesty or stupidity, and I am not sure that it does not permeate most of our other activities. On the other hand, free criticism of public servants, while often cruel and unjust and hard to endure, is an efficacious antidote to the poison of self-importance, sometimes called bureaucracy, to which as a class they are peculiarly susceptible. All public servants, from the President and the Supreme Court down, ought to be inoculated periodically with this antidote, and I hope that you will bear this in mind in the discussion which is to follow my remarks.

Incidentally, I may say that when I first became enrolled in the public service, some 16 years ago, as a member of the Public Service Commission of Massachusetts, a wise old acquaintance took me aside and gave me this advice: "A good motto," he said, "is, you never regret having said too little." He went on to say, "In your opinions recite the facts briefly, and then state your conclusions but not your reasons. Your conclusions may be right but your reasons may be wrong." While I concede the practical shrewdness of this advice, I have never believed it to be consistent with sound public policy. Brevity in opinions is surely

desirable, and it is quite true that some of us, perhaps through pride of opinion, forget this now and then. But, on the other hand, those interested in a case are entitled to know, not only the conclusions but as nearly as possible how those conclusions were reached. This is, I believe, essential to the free interchange, growth, and development of thought, the correction of errors, and gradual progress in the application of sound and enduring principles.

With this preliminary, I come to my chosen topics for discussion, and the first of these will be valuation. It lies at the root of public regulation of rates in this country, as now practiced. It is well enough to say in a law that the rates charged by a railroad or utility must be "just and reasonable," but those words do not interpret themselves. How shall we know when a given level of rates is "just and reasonable"? To answer that question it is necessary to find some rule or principle to apply as a measuring rod. So far at least as the lower limits of reasonableness are concerned, the Supreme Court thought, with the best intentions in the world, that it had found the answer to that question when it enunciated the rule, away back in 1898, that a railroad or utility is entitled to a reasonable return upon the fair value of the property which it uses in the public service.

The fact is, however, that this rule precipitated a confusion of thought and a welter of litigation which have laid a paralyzing hand upon the public regulation of rates ever since it was enunciated. I do not mean, of course, that any complete paralysis has resulted, for I know that public regulation has accomplished much that has been useful and beneficial. But I do mean that the valuation doctrine has hampered and embarrassed and grievously delayed regulation to an extent which has given rise to serious and warranted concern. If the total amount which has been spent upon railroad and utility valuations could be ascertained, if the total time consumed in wrangling upon this subject before commissions and courts could be totaled, if all of the lawyers and so-called experts who make a living—and often a fat living—from this hurly-burly could be placed in line, I believe that the country would be staggered by the exhibition.

In this brief address I shall not undertake any reasoned exposition of this subject, but shall avail myself of the privilege which a speaker on such an occasion as this has of stating a few more or less emphatic conclusions, and pointing them by certain illustrations. But before I do this, let me call attention to something which has puzzled me considerably and which ought to be of interest to you. Business men presumably are concerned with the general level of the charges which they pay for the services of railroads and utilities. Sometimes they say that they are interested only in the relation of rates between themselves and their competitors, but upon analysis I question whether they will stand by this theory. In determining the general level of rates valuation is basic. It is the corner stone of the structure. Yet in the course of 16 years of active experience in public regulation I have seen little or no indication of interest in this vital matter upon the part of business men. Certainly in the valuation of railroads the Interstate Commerce Commission has never received help from any organization of business men—national, State, or local. We have had help from the State commissions and from labor organizations. Without it, indeed, our valuations would have been ex parte proceedings with no opposition to combat the railroad claims, except that provided by our own departments. I do not mean that business organizations might have been expected to go into the details of particular valuations. The point is that they have manifested no interest in even the vitally important underlying principles.

The essential difficulty with railroad and utility valuations is that no one has ever been able to arrive at any clear understanding of what is meant precisely by "fair value for rate-making purposes." Certainly it is not any value known to economists or known to business men in their commercial dealings. The value of an ordinary business property is determined primarily by its earning power, by the profits which it can be made to yield. But here we are asked to ascertain a "fair value" which is to be a controlling element in determining the maximum rates which may be charged. In other words, it is not the product of earning power, but a limitation upon and the basis of earning power. According to the court, it is to be determined from the consideration of a number of specified factors, often mutually inconsistent, which are to be given, along with any other relevant matters, "such weight as may be just and right in each case." Obviously the opportunity for debate in arriving at such a figure is without limit, a fact which is attested by the interminable proceedings before commissions and courts.

While there is no fixed practice as yet, and none which has been authoritatively prescribed by the court, there is a tendency to arrive at "fair value" by taking an estimated amount for all lands used, based on the current market value of the adjoining lands; adding the estimated cost of reproduction of the structural property, at approximately current prices; deducting an estimated allowance for depreciation, varying with taste; adding an estimated allowance for working capital; and adding, finally, again according to taste, some figure for that elusive ghost which goes by the name of "going concern value." A "fair value" reached by a formula like this was used in a case recently considered by the Supreme Court which had to do with the street-railway system of Baltimore. By way of illustration, let me contrast this case with the situation of your Boston Elevated Railway.

Under the present public-trustee plan every holder of Boston Elevated bonds and preferred stock receives the fixed rate of re-

turn to which he is entitled, the city and the State receive adequate rentals for the subways which they own, and the holders of common stock receive 6 per cent dividends. If my computations are correct, the average rate of return upon the total recorded investment in the property, including the subways, is about 4.7 per cent. Leaving out the subways, it is about 4.9 per cent. Furthermore, the dividends upon common stock could be increased to 8 or 10 per cent without increasing this average rate of return very materially. Contrast this with the Baltimore case, where the Supreme Court held that it would be confiscatory to enforce rates producing a less return upon "fair value" than the 7.44 per cent which the company sought, and added these words:

"In the light of recent decisions of this court and other Federal decisions, it is not certain that rates securing a return of 7.5 per cent, or even 8 per cent, on the value of the property would not be necessary to avoid confiscation."

Bear in mind that this was a return upon "fair value," rather than upon actual, recorded investment. I think it certain that if a "fair value" were estimated for the Boston Elevated property by the formula followed in Baltimore the resulting total would be very largely in excess of the recorded investment in the property. Under this formula even the city-owned and state-owned subways would probably be included in the total at present cost of reproduction, because of the fact that they are property used by the elevated, and notwithstanding the fact that the actual rentals paid for their use are at the rate of only 4.5 per cent on original cost.

Let me direct your attention to certain other results of a formula like this. In recent years various street improvements have been made in downtown Boston at great cost. Streets have been widened and it has been necessary to condemn expensive real estate for that purpose. Those of you who live in Boston have doubtless deemed yourselves fortunate that such a process has not been necessary in the case of most of your streets, and that they were laid out and built in due season many years ago when land values were low. Under the "fair value" doctrine, however, no such advantage can be secured from building public rail highways in due season at low costs. On the contrary, as the market value of adjoining lands swells with rising population, the "fair value" of the lands occupied by these rail highways rises in the same measure and the carriers are permitted to charge you rates as high as if these rail highways were being constructed by some incredibly wasteful legerdemain anew each year through crowded metropolitan centers. And this would be true even if these lands had originally been donated to the railroads, as many lands were throughout the country.

And let us analyze the cost of reproduction theory as applied to structural property. Costs of reproduction fluctuate with the changing value of money and also with improvements in methods of construction. They differ every year. So long as unit prices were going up, as they did until 1920, some of the time at a very steep rate, this theory was of great advantage to companies whose properties were so valued. It gave them "fair values" very largely in excess of the original cost of their properties, and since they paid fixed rates of return on bonds and preferred stock the whole advantage of this excess went to the common stock, to the extent that they were able to realize the permissible earnings. But we are now in a period of declining prices and the rapid introduction of mechanical labor-saving devices which decrease costs of construction. The time may be not far distant when the cost of reproduction theory on its face will work the other way for railroads and utilities, and some farseeing men in these industries are beginning to sense this situation.

However, it is not clear that they have cause for alarm, as I began to perceive on recent close study of the Baltimore case to which I have already referred. In considering what is a reasonable rate of return upon "fair value," the Supreme Court had this to say in that case:

"It is manifest that just compensation for a utility, requiring for efficient public service skillful and prudent management as well as use of the plant, and whose rates are subject to public regulation, is more than current interest on mere investment. Sound business management requires that after paying all expenses of operation, setting aside the necessary sums for depreciation, payment of interest and reasonable dividends, there should still remain something to be passed to the surplus account; and a rate of return which does not admit of that being done is not sufficient to assure confidence in the financial soundness of the utility to maintain its credit and enable it to raise money necessary for the proper discharge of its public duties. In this view of the matter, a return of 6.26 per cent is clearly inadequate."

The fair inference to be drawn from this, it seems to me, assuming the cost of reproduction theory to prevail, is that if such costs should so fall that "fair value" would be materially below original cost, with the result that anything like a normal return would endanger the dividends, surplus, and credit of a utility, it would become the duty of the regulating authorities under the Constitution to raise the "reasonable rate of return" sufficiently to protect the dividends, surplus, and credit.

Let us analyze this a bit further. It is a poor rule which does not work both ways. If it is the duty of regulating authorities to raise the reasonable rate of return above normal to avoid a deficiency in dividends and surplus, why in all fairness should it not be their duty to depress the rate below normal in order to avoid an excess in dividends and surplus? But if this be done, it at once appears that the amount of the "fair value" is largely

immaterial, for it is evident that the desired results can be produced by adjustments in the reasonable rate of return regardless of "fair value."

This brings me to the crux of my remarks on this topic. In reality we are here dealing, not with a question of law, but with a question of economics and practical good sense. You will look in vain for the "fair value" rule in the Constitution. It is merely a judicial interpretation of the constitutional amendments which provide that no person shall be deprived of property without "due process of law." The Supreme Court undertook to determine at what point the public regulation of rates would in practical effect be equivalent to a taking of property without due process of law, and the "fair value" rule was its answer. It set limits to regulation. Necessarily, however, this rule and the attempted definition of "fair value" which accompanied it were based on essentially economic considerations and conceptions or preconceptions. Two of the present justices have said that the rule is "economically unsound," and experience has shown them to be right. As I see it, a sounder view of the matter was suggested by the Supreme Court in the passage from the Baltimore case, bearing on credit and reasonable rate of return, which I quoted a moment ago.

The railroads and the utilities perform public functions. We permit private companies to perform such functions because of a rather general belief, which I personally do not wholly share, that they can do the work better than the State. The laborer is worthy of his hire. So long as the railroads and utilities are managed honestly and with reasonable efficiency and economy, we all want to pay these laborers of ours enough so that they will be willing and able to do the work well. Certainly they should not be paid less, and I can think of no good reason why they should be paid more. And in determining what is enough for this purpose, there is no need for shaving hairs. A fair degree of liberality is appropriate.

Now, the essential test of whether these railroads and utilities are being paid enough, it seems to me, is their ability under honest and good management to attract the new capital which is constantly necessary if they are to meet the needs of a growing community. Massachusetts grasped this idea many years ago, before ever the "fair value" rule was enunciated. It proceeded on the theory that it would regulate the securities issued by these companies and see to it that no more were issued than the demands of the business justified and that they represented the actual investment of capital. This done, it endeavored to regulate rates so that earnings would be sufficient to attract investors in these securities. This policy has, I believe, been consistently and successfully pursued in the case of the Massachusetts gas and electric companies, and it was successfully pursued in the case of the street railways until they fell upon evil days, which were no fault of public regulation. To a certain extent it was followed, and with advantage, in the case of the Massachusetts railroads, but there the situation was unfortunately complicated by conflicts of jurisdiction with other States.

Under such a policy it is obvious that no periodic and interminable valuations, so called, are needed. Regulation proceeds on a basis of practical sound sense, and justice is done to both investors and public. The absence of appeals from Massachusetts regulation to the United States Supreme Court confirms this statement. No matter what "fair value" might be estimated with the aid of ingenious lawyers and experts, it is difficult and embarrassing for a company to claim confiscation if it is paying 8, 10, or 12 per cent dividends on its common stock and has a ready market for new issues.

If such a policy of regulation had been followed throughout the country consistently from the beginning, we would have no valuation problem. The origin of that problem can be traced directly to the watered stock and exploitation by construction companies which accompanied the building and development of many of our railroads and utilities in the absence of any proper public regulation. It is that fact which is the source of our difficulties now. The securities of such companies obviously can not be taken as the basis for rate regulation. On the other hand, our National and State Governments were negligent in permitting this situation to arise, and the public can not expect to avoid all the consequences of their negligence.

The circumstances call for some degree of compromise in dealing with what has been done in the past and in arriving at a starting point from which sound regulation for the future can proceed. In deciding what that compromise should be, the valuation data which have been accumulated at enormous expense in the case of the railroads and many of the utilities could be used to good purpose.

All this is suggestive merely. I am not undertaking in these remarks to outline a specific plan. My object is only to indicate some of the difficulties of the present situation and certain general principles which I believe must be applied if we are ever to have a sound and effective system of public regulation. I think it likely, also, that conditions are gradually shaping themselves so that a solution of these difficulties will be feasible. The decline in general level of prices will in itself have a strong influence in that direction, if it persists. Points of view are often curiously changed by shifts in economic conditions. Success in reaching a solution will depend largely upon the intelligence and pertinacity with which it is sought. If the business men of the country who are independent of the railroads and utilities want a solution and will work for it, I feel confident that they can have it. As things go nowadays they have enormous influence, and up to date this is

an influence which has been a minus quantity, so far as this phase of public regulation is concerned.

What I have already said leads directly to the second matter which I shall undertake to discuss. One of the great dangers in the private operation of railroads and utilities is that they will be exploited for the making of illegitimate profits. I mean profits that are derived indirectly from improper dealings with the companies rather than directly from their operation. The history of railroads and utilities in this country is well-nigh a chronicle of such profits, and they have been the source of many enormous fortunes. And again I direct attention to the fact that this is a matter with which the business men of the country and their organizations have seldom concerned themselves, if at all. At least if they have, it has escaped my notice.

The chief opportunity for such illegitimate profits is found in financing. It is an open opportunity when the issue of securities is not regulated. It is lost when they are regulated adequately. Nor is it enough to regulate only the securities of the railroads and utilities, for the same manipulation can be practiced through the device of holding companies. Broadly speaking, the game is to acquire control of a company, either at the time of its construction or at some favorable opportunity thereafter, issue securities which are based in part on hopes rather than on actual investment in the property, stimulate these hopes by the various devices known to artful publicity and salesmanship, unload at the earliest opportunity upon what are known as "innocent investors," "widows and orphans" preferred, and leave them holding the bag and the exploiters holding the profits, and also usually retaining control.

I have often heard it argued, and sometimes in very respectable quarters, that the overcapitalization of railroads and utilities is of no concern to the public, and still less the overcapitalization of the superimposed holding companies, for the reason that the basis of rate regulation is not outstanding securities but the "fair value" of the railroad and utility properties. I have already discussed the "fair value" doctrine and pointed out what I believe to be some of its weaknesses. But even if that doctrine were flawless this argument in regard to overcapitalization would still, in my opinion, be utterly fallacious and unsound. If experience in public regulation has taught me anything, it is that overcapitalization of railroads and utilities, direct or indirect, is a dangerous and often effective obstacle to proper public regulation and the furnishing of good service at reasonable rates.

Once inflated securities are outstanding in the hands of investors, every effort will be made to make good on them; and if these efforts fail, the maintenance, service, and credit of the underlying properties in the long run are bound to suffer. One of the common efforts to make good consists in throwing batteries of lawyers and experts into the breach to fight before the commissions and the courts for inflated valuations, so called. Another effort, not uncommon, consists in an endeavor to impair the efficiency of the regulating commissions, through the selection of men who are deemed by those making the effort to be suitable commissioners or the removal, in one way or another, of those whom they deem to be unsuitable, or through the withholding of adequate appropriations. A further effort, which seems to be rather common now in the utility field, consists in the indirect appropriation of illegitimate profits through the padding of charges to operating expenses or construction.

Let me explain this further source of illegitimate profits, for it is important. The practice is comparatively rare among railroads, if it exists at all, so I shall start the explanation with railroads by way of contrast. The management of a railroad is provided by its own paid officers, and so, very largely, is its engineering and accounting. Outside firms of engineers or accountants may be employed occasionally for special jobs, but they are not under common control with the railroad and the contract is made at arm's length. In the case of many utilities which are controlled by large holding companies this is not the practice. Management and engineering and often numerous other services are supplied by contract with kindred companies which are under the same common control. It is all in the family, with no dealing at arm's length. Those contracts are on all manner of bases, but for the most part they are alike in the fact that they contemplate a profit over and above the cost of the services. What that profit is can not be determined with accuracy unless the books of the contractor are examined, and ordinarily those are beyond the jurisdiction of the regulating commission. It would be a precisely analogous situation if a railroad should contract with a company under common control to supply it with trainmen or locomotive engineers at the cost of their services plus a profit.

Certainly railroads and utilities are entitled to a fair profit upon their operations, but that profit should be taken directly in the form of dividends upon stock, where it can be seen and measured and appraised. All devices by which these companies are made to yield indirect profits to those who own or control them embarrass and impede public regulation and in the long run lead only to high rates or poor service. They are directly opposed to the public interest. There is no difficulty in managing and operating these properties in a simple, normal, and conservative way. The moment complexities appear, particularly those which involve tangled webs of interrelated and interdealing companies, there is ground for more than a reasonable suspicion that some form of manipulation or exploitation is under way.

The topics which I have discussed so far relate to public regulation generally. I have selected them for discussion because they

are live, vital topics of great public importance. The fact is, however, that at the present time they are of more consequence in utility regulation than in railroad regulation. Financial exploitation through overcapitalization, direct or indirect, was a great evil in the railroad past, but now the securities which railroads directly issue are all subject to Federal supervision and holding companies have no very widespread influence in their affairs. They were used in the past with results which in notable cases were disastrous and they are beginning to appear again. But Congress has this matter under investigation, and it may be hoped that the future will be safeguarded.

The question of valuation is also, I think, becoming of lesser importance so far as the railroads are concerned, although it certainly ought not to be disregarded. I say this because there is reason to believe that competitive means of transportation—by water, highway, pipe line, and air—are developing as factors in the situation so rapidly that it is not at all unlikely that there are now, or soon will be, limitations more potent than public regulation upon the aggregate revenues which the railroads may earn. I refer to inland waterways, to motor busses and trucks and private automobiles, to pipe lines for both crude and refined oils and natural gas, and to the carriage of mail and passengers by airplanes. There is also the long-distance transmission of electric power. The situation is one which may well cause the railroads serious concern, and the best brains at their command will need to work at high pressure to meet it. I think they will measure up to the need, but the next few years are likely to see radical changes in methods of handling traffic. It is dangerous to prophesy, so I shall be content with that comment.

Incidentally shippers also may well give thought to this situation. There may be need for some constructive action on their part and perhaps on the part of the Government as well. Competition is by no means an unmixed blessing. It is quite arguable that it demands regulation in the public interest as much as monopoly. It can be very wasteful, destructive, and costly. The advantages are patent and easily perceived. The disadvantages are often latent and not so easily recognized. For example, I have no doubt that even the competition of the railroads with each other gives rise to heavy costs which a monopoly could avoid. How the account balances I do not know, and I doubt whether anyone knows. But these are matters worthy of the serious consideration of the shipping public.

I come now to the topic which more particularly interests you, and that is the specific regulation of railroad freight rates. It is a topic which I approach with not a little hesitation and caution, for I have to deal with it every day, not theoretically but practically, and I know its pitfalls and difficulties. The little which I shall say about it here will be said in no dogmatic spirit but with all due humility and appreciation of the fact that there are depths in this subject which I have not yet plumbed.

The freight-rate structure of the country, as you know, is an affair of infinite variety. It is so complex that it takes a special kind of expert to read and comprehend freight-rate tariffs, and even they fall down on the job now and then. We spend a considerable part of our time at the commission in deciding cases which involve nothing but the interpretation of tariffs. At the bottom all this variety and intricacy grow out of the fact that the freight-rate structure had its beginning and a large part of its development at a time when the railroads were practically free agents and the individual railroads were comparatively small affairs. Between many points they competed sharply with each other, and between many other points they competed with water carriers, which in the dawn of railroad history were a much larger factor in the transportation situation than they are to-day. And even where there were no paralleling lines every railroad had producers in its territory who were competing with producers in some other territory, and all these producers were striving to reach the larger markets for their goods on something like equal terms.

Naturally, the result of all these conflicting forces was that rates were cut to the quick where competition was the sharpest, and where it was less vigorous or did not exist at all they were made as high as possible to offset such cuts. It was the heyday of the big shipper, who prospered on rebates, and of the big community which had competition which lesser communities did not enjoy. The competition was so sharp and unrestrained that most of the inland water carriers were driven out of existence. Complaints of discrimination were inevitable, and it was because of those complaints, very largely, that the Interstate Commerce Commission was created.

This was the kind of a freight-rate structure with which the commission was called upon to deal at the time of its creation in 1887. There had been many attempts at State regulation by legislatures or commissions prior to that time, but as each State was working in its own interest and the interstate rates were not subject to regulation, these attempts served only to complicate the situation still further. Moreover, the commission in its early days met with stout resistance from the carriers at every step, and in the ensuing litigation its powers were construed and interpreted away to such an extent that its regulation had no important effect upon the rate structure until the further legislation of 1906 and the still more important amendments of 1910.

Now, I want for a moment to suggest one or two basic principles of general application which it seems to me must govern the commission in its regulation of rates. Neither the commission nor any of its members can with any regard for its sworn duties place the interests of any one part of the country above those of another.

It will be an evil day if sectionalism gains any important voice in the counsels of the commission. By the same token it is the duty of the commission, with due regard for differences in conditions, to treat all shippers and all localities alike and have no favorites. A further general principle which must be borne in mind is that the railroads are privately operated and it is not the function of the commission to manage them.

This latter principle calls for some explanation. Public regulation is not management, but it is necessarily an interference with management. Every order that the commission enters constitutes an act of interference. But there is a realm of management which I believe has been left free to the private owners. Without defining it closely, let me illustrate this realm, as I understand it. As has been seen, railroads are monopolistic only in part, and they are subject to much competition. It is not the policy of the law to prevent this competition, within reasonable limits, but on the other hand it is not required. If the commission should undertake to compel the railroads to cut rates for competitive reasons, it would be exceeding its authority and trespassing upon a discretion of management which has been left to the private owners. As another illustration, it may be that a railroad could stimulate certain traffic and increase its revenue by reducing rates, as is often suggested in the case of passenger traffic. This, however, is a question of wisdom in management, and so long as the rates do not exceed a reasonable maximum, I believe that this matter also must be left to the discretion of the owners.

There is a further observation which I wish to make at this point. Changes in freight-rate relations benefit some and injure others. If the changes are just, those who suffer disadvantage are those who have had an undue advantage before. That being the case, the fact that some one finds his situation changed for the worse is no proof that the change should not have been made. Indeed, as I have already pointed out, the commission was created for the prime purpose of changing rate relations and thereby eliminating discriminations. In saying this, I do not mean that no consideration should be paid to established custom and practice. Unless the law requires it, as it sometimes does, changes should not be made in the absence of a demonstrated need. There are, for example, various important rate adjustments throughout the country which are incapable of any very logical defense, but no one complains, and they seem to meet the needs of the shippers, carriers, and consumers. So long as this situation continues, I know of no good reason why such adjustments should be changed.

From what I have said, fragmentary as it has been, I think it will be evident that the commission can not make rates as the railroads made them in the past. It must have some system or plan in mind which will stand the test of the law, and accord equal treatment, all things considered, to all shippers, localities, and kinds or descriptions of traffic. Its ultimate goal must be the bringing of order out of chaos, to the extent that this is possible so long as competition plays an important part in railroad affairs.

After gaining real power over rates some 20 years ago, the commission largely confined itself, aside from the great general cases involving horizontal changes in rates to meet revenue needs, to the hearing and decision of individual complaints, as they were filed. With experience it became evident, however, that rate adjustments all over the country were interlocked to a greater extent than had been appreciated, and that changes under specific complaints in the rates between particular points or localities often caused disturbances elsewhere which brought in more complaints. Certainly, as time went on there was no diminution in the inflow of complaints, but, on the contrary, they increased in general from year to year. From this point of view it seemed desirable to consider rate adjustments comprehensively, throughout large territories or the country as a whole, instead of dealing with them in random and piecemeal fashion. The result was a growing tendency to institute large and general investigations of particular rate adjustments, where need for investigation seemed to exist. This was a tendency which made itself felt before Congress adopted the Hoch-Smith resolution, commanding a comprehensive analysis and consideration of the entire freight-rate structure, and it was a tendency which I believe would have continued to develop if that resolution had never been made a part of the law.

Along with this development there was also a growing tendency, which began a good many years ago, to fix rates, at least certain kinds of rates, on a mileage or distance basis. This was no new principle in rate making. The railroads had used distance scales in numerous situations from the very beginning. But the commission has greatly extended the application of this principle. In essence it was applied in the great country-wide revision of express rates about 17 years ago, and not long after in the extensive revision of class rates throughout central territory. Since that time it has been applied on a large scale in numerous other situations, particularly in the case of class rates. Such a system of rates has the manifest advantage that it treats all shippers and localities alike on one common basis. It plays no favorites, and all are given the advantage or disadvantage of their geographical location.

The reason for the use of such a system of rates, where it has been used, have been explained in detail by the commission in its reports, and I shall not undertake to go into similar detail here. In general the results from its use, so far as we are able to judge from the filing of formal complaints, have been satisfactory. There has, however, been considerable talk in opposition to what is called the "mileage theory," and grave fears have been

expressed as to the results, more particularly if it should be applied to the rate adjustments on various commodities. That it may not be well adapted in undiluted form to every situation, particularly where low-grade so-called basic commodities are involved, and that rate groups or blankets of varying extent are often desirable, has often been indicated by the commission itself. What I have already said about the influence of established custom and practice may also be recalled again here.

I have no desire to debate the so-called "mileage theory" in these remarks, and doubt whether it would be appropriate; but let me say that the commission is not now, so far as I know, wedded beyond divorce to that theory or any other theory of making rates. We do wish to make rates by principle, and by the soundest that we can discover. If those who condemn what they call "mileage" rates will present some definite substitute plan which they think ought to be followed, it will, I am sure, receive respectful and careful consideration, and I have no doubt that it will be adopted if it is found to be an improvement over the methods which we have been following. For myself I can say, however, that an essential feature of any plan, before it can be adopted, must be equality of treatment without favoritism or other form of unjust discrimination.

So far as I have been able to discover, those who oppose what they term the "mileage theory" believe, in a not altogether definite way, that there should be some system of rates which will permit all producers of a given commodity, or some of them, to reach the important consuming markets, or some of them, on equal terms, or something like equal terms. I am not sure just how far they carry their belief. Of course a postage-stamp system of rates would accomplish this result perfectly, but that could hardly be adopted by the railroads. It may be, also, that some other plan might be worked out which would accomplish the desired result, or an approximation of it, and which would be practicable. There are a considerable number of relatively simple situations where rate blankets can be used to advantage, and meet with general approval. With that exception and so far as complicated situations are concerned, all that I can say is that I have not yet seen or heard of a satisfactory substitute which plays no favorites and does not leave certain shippers or receivers of freight or localities out in the cold. If there is such a plan, let it be produced for consideration. I call attention to the fact, however, that if such a plan could be developed which would be fair to all of the shippers, it would seem that it must inevitably result in charging relatively low rates for long hauls and relatively high rates for short hauls. Whether this would be fair in all cases to individual railroads, or whether it could be made effective, so far as the short hauls are concerned, in the face of motor-truck competition may be doubted.

I could say more on this subject, but this is all that time will permit. At least you have one suggestion for consideration, and that is this: "If you don't like the 'mileage theory' or any other theory which you think we are following, bring forward some definite plan for consideration which will be comprehensive, fair to all, and practicable." You are at liberty, of course, within reasonable limits, to secure from the railroads such advantages as they may voluntarily extend by reason of competition to all similarly situated. But the commission is not the dispenser of competitive favors.

Before I close let me add one further word. Everybody concedes that both cost and value of service should be considered in arriving at fair rates for particular commodities. There is no agreement, however, as to what the costs or values of particular services are or as to what weight they should be given in arriving at rates. These are exceedingly difficult and important questions. In my opinion they deserve closer attention than they have had in the past. They call for extensive research. We have already done quite a little along those lines, but much remains to be done. I hope that we shall be able to report material progress from time to time, and reflect the results of our research to some reasonable extent in our work.

I end by repeating in substance what I said in beginning the discussion of this topic, and I believe that I can safely say it for the commission. The public regulation of freight rates is an intricate and burdensome task. We are performing that task to the best of our ability and are striving to be guided by sound principle. But we are not dogmatists, and we are searching for the light. If you or anyone else has a better lantern to guide our footsteps than those we are using, we shall welcome it with joy and thanksgiving.

PROHIBITION ENFORCEMENT

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Mrs. John R. Williams, on December 4, 1930, under the auspices of the Women's Organization Against the Prohibition Amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The address is as follows:

I feel deeply honored by the request of the women's council to speak a few words on the subject that means so much to the quarter of a million members of this organization. I can but think that the only reason I have been asked is because I am fast approaching the Biblical allotment of threescore years and 10. There is a soundness of judgment accredited to one looking

back over the years that have gone—that many people are willing to believe is safer than foretelling the future.

I have no statistics to offer—certainly no oratory—but I can tell you how keenly this organization feels against the unfortunate influence of the Volstead Act.

One of my early recollections of life is the town of St. Louis in the early seventies. At that time the city was not much more than a straggly village, with an enormous space about one-quarter mile square right in its center. It was called Hay Market Corner. Here during the summer months the farmer would bring his load of hay to sell—in fact, this was his only clearing house for his grain. Of course, there were saloons along the Square; and whereas I am no advocate for this form of entertainment, yet I can truthfully say it was a quiet, orderly, peaceful crowd. There were no fights, no shooting up, and nothing that in the least resembled a prohibition raid. The principal street leading into the town was called then, as now, the King's Highway. It was the usual impassible thoroughfare, full of holes and bumps, 2 feet deep in mud during the wet weather, and lost in a blinding storm of dust at other times. But you never saw a wagon bottom side up in the ditch; nor were you startled by the honk-honk of the bicycle cop; nor the scurrying around the corner of some one flying from justice; nor did you ask yourself the question that is frequently suggested now, Who will be killed next?

For those were the days before prohibition, when a drink was not forbidden fruit; its importance did not register; it was nothing to think about and certainly nothing to be taxed for. Money in those days was spent to develop the country, to build up cities, and advance trade, not to be handed over to a few fanatics to toy with and experiment with to push forward their own particular fads. And so fades out the picture.

Have you ever stopped to consider how the civil law and the church law go together, almost side by side? The first thing we do in the raising of our children is to send them to the public school and the Sunday school. In the Sunday school the child is taught the Ten Commandments. They are put in words of one syllable. He is taught not to steal, not to burn down houses, not to kill, etc. He reads Bible stories—the story of the loaves and the fishes and changing the water into wine. He quite understands. The child grows up and the laws of the country are nearly the same. There is nothing confusing—all in a perfectly natural sequence. Then the day comes when he is offered a glass of beer; but he must not take it, for this has become a crime!

Is it always a crime? he asks.

Oh, no; if you care to motor into Canada, or drop down into Cuba, or take a 3-mile sail off the Jersey coast, then it is no longer a crime. It is all a question of geography. Think of the fantastic brain that could weave such an absurd law. I am grateful that some sprightly young Congressman with a sense of humor did not make a law forbidding eggs and bacon for breakfast! For I like eggs!

When was this Volstead Act created? During the war, when, with many other requests, it was considered a temporary measure. We were asked to ease up on gasoline, to eat as little as possible, to save on sugar, to get out and work in the hospitals, and at the canteen, etc. The country did not stop and argue, but responded with blind obedience.

The war was over.

Everything drifted back to the normal except the Volstead Act. This was the opportunity for the unsuccessful politician and the soft-drink man, rum agent, and the raffia, who were benefited by this act, to forge to the front, and thus wet and dry ranged up for battle. It did not look like an even fight. The dries—well-trained soldiers, experienced, well organized, with an underground system nearly perfect; and the wets—fewer in number, ragged, with their backs to the wall, but full of enthusiasm and determination and the look of the crusaders of old, fighting for decency and honesty, and never will they allow the next generation to be destroyed by the very laws created to save them!

The pity of it all is that our youth of to-day are the ones who get the brunt of it. The older generation have experience and common sense to go on, and the babes in the cradle will never have to struggle with it. It will be dead and forgotten long before they come to years of reason. But the young things now in their teens will suffer from it. Prohibition has taught them law-breaking and deceit. It has introduced them to the hip flask and the speak-easy. It has trained them to do what they please, "only it must be under the rose," and as for obedience and "to honor their father and their mother," why they will explain to you with a laugh, that those were the principles of the old-fashioned girl and old-fashioned boy. I do not criticize them! The fault is not theirs! You can not train a young and tender vine to grow crooked and then, when about to bloom, become straight. But I do say that I hope this vicious law will be repealed before it does more damage. These boys and girls have no standards; they look around them bewildered, not knowing which lead to follow. Do you suppose they have not all read with breathless interest "The Man with the Green Hat"?—this man who provided whisky and gin and wine for the statesmen on the Hill, the man who filled up their cellars—and helped out their friends and constituents.

My wanderings into the world of workers brought me into contact with a young mother the other day who told me with tears in her eyes that her small boy had decided that when he grew up he would become a bootlegger. She explained that gone was the lure of other days—the small imaginative boy no longer

dreamed of going West and becoming a cowboy on a bucking bronco, or following the Indians in the covered wagon, or starting out as a pirate for lands of gold. No, sir! He was going to Canada and return with a motor full of kegs, crossing the border on a dark night along a lonely country road! Or possibly get a speed boat and dash through the rum blockade off Fire Island on a stormy night, with seas running high, lights dimmed, then the signal on the beach, a hasty unloading, the warehouse, then dis-bursing and fading into the night!

I told the young mother she need not fear; before her boy was much older a wise old Nation would change this impossible law. But we could not say to the small boy that such things did not exist! He had seen too much, and heard too much, and read too much!

So we women of the Council of Prohibition Reform in the District are putting up the strongest plea in our power for repeal of this law. Other countries have made mistakes and rectified them. Are we so conceited that we think we can not make a mistake? Are we going to pound through the years with shouts of more and more money and more and more time?

Time!—when the moments are flying fast the hospitals are filling faster, and the prisons are being enlarged and multiplied!

Let's take our bags of gold. We were taxed for it and gave it gladly. But let us use it for the man without a job! He is poor and unhappy, and the winter is cold; food hard to get. Think of the 3,000,000 happy hearts we can enroll—with the millions put aside for prohibition. We wish no idleness. We will create the jobs. Why not follow out L'Enfant's idea and make the whole country beautiful instead of one town? Let us build roads, and bridges, and culverts, and gardens with streams, and glorious pathways—anything to make willing hands useful and busy brains create! The scenery is all there—the money, the unemployed, the bread line and the soup kitchen! Let's join them together! Let's fill up our coffers! Put liquor—since the country will have it—under Government control; render powerless the gangster with his underground traffic; remove temptation from our courts, our police, and our statesmen, for these men designated to enforce the law are the least equipped to withstand its temptations.

Think of the happy days within our reach! The awful war is over. The trials of prohibition are forgotten, and once more over this glorious country will wave the flag of peace—peace!

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES AND APPROVALS

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On July 7, 1930:

S. 3061. An act to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to create a Department of Labor," approved March 4, 1913.

On July 8, 1930:

S. 859. An act for the relief of Clara E. Nichols;

S. 1406. An act for the relief of Mary S. Howard, Gertrude M. Caton, Nellie B. Reed, Gertrude Pierce, Katie Pensel, Josephine Pryor, Mary L. McCormick, Mrs. James Blanchfield, Sadie T. Nicoll, Katie Lloyd, Mrs. Benjamin Warner, Eva K. Pensel, Margaret Y. Kirk, C. Albert George, Earl Wroldsen, Benjamin Carpenter, Nathan Benson, Paul Kirk, Townsend Walters, George Freet, James B. Jefferson, Frank Ellison, Emil Kulchicky, Harold S. Stubbs, and the Bethel Cemetery Co.; and

S. 1756. An act granting the sum of \$5,000 to reimburse the family of the late Harold L. Lytle for hospital and medical expenses and loss of salary due to an injury received in a collision with a Government truck in Portsmouth, N. H., May 10, 1927.

On July 10, 1930:

S. 2498. An act to promote the better protection and highest public use of lands of the United States and adjacent lands and waters in northern Minnesota for the production of forest products, and for other purposes.

On December 12, 1930:

S. 328. An act for the relief of Edward C. Dunlap.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14804) making supplemental appropriations to provide for emergency construction on certain public works during the remainder of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, with a view to increasing employment, requested a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Wood, Mr. Cramton, Mr.

Wason, Mr. Byrns, and Mr. Buchanan were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House has passed a bill (H. R. 14675) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message transmitted to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. Lee Slater Overman, late a Senator from the State of North Carolina.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 14675) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate sundry messages from the President of the United States making nominations and submitting treaties, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State showing all receipts and disbursements on account of refunds, allowances, and annuities for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1929, in connection with the Foreign Service retirement and disability system, as required by section 18 (a) of an act for the reorganization and improvement of the Foreign Service of the United States, and for other purposes, approved May 24, 1924.

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 15, 1930.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR EMERGENCY CONSTRUCTION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14804) making supplemental appropriations to provide for emergency construction on certain public works during the remainder of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, with a view to increasing employment, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the conference asked by the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, I saw a statement in the press on yesterday to the effect that the conferees have agreed before a conference has ever been asked, and before there has been any formal conference. Before these conferees are appointed I want to enter a protest to the Senate receding on the amendments made by the Senate and on which it is reported in the press that the Senate conferees have agreed with the House or, in other words, that they have disagreed to the Senate amendment. It is a most unusual procedure to have conferees give out, at least to the public, their conclusions before the Senate has even been asked to appoint conferees. If those conferees are now going to meet in good faith since the result of the conference has been announced in the press, then I want to be assured that a real genuine consideration is to be given to the Senate amendments.

Mr. MCKELLAR. To what bill does the Senator refer?

Mr. COUZENS. The Senator from Washington [Mr. Jones] has moved that the Senate insist upon its amendments to the so-called unemployment relief appropriation bill, and asks to have conferees appointed, and yet I understand from the press that the conferees have already met

while not yet appointed and have reached an agreement; that is, the Senate conferees who are now to be appointed have already agreed to disagree to the Senate amendments. It is a most unusual procedure, and I am going to protest against it when the conference report comes before the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Michigan is entirely right about it. I want to call attention to a statement in the press that section 4, which had been unanimously stricken out by the Senate, had been agreed to by the conferees; that is, I mean the Senate conferees not yet appointed have agreed to the restoration of section 4. I want to express to the chairman of the committee the hope that this has not been done and I hope it will not be done, because if it is done the Senator will certainly have a fight on the floor when the conference report comes before the Senate.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I simply desire to say that it is not an unusual practice for the conferees to meet before they are actually appointed. It is known who the conferees will be, and this is done in order to expedite matters. But the conference has not given out what was the result of its conference. How it got out I do not know. I certainly did not give it out.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, the material inquiry is whether the prospective conferees have actually agreed.

Mr. JONES. The prospective conferees have actually agreed.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Upon what theory, may I ask the Senator, did the Senate conferees recede from the position of the Senate touching the provision which gives the President the power to expend all the money carried in the bill for one of the purposes of the bill if he sees fit to do it, the bill having itself allocated the appropriations to the various purposes mentioned in it?

Mr. JONES. The Senator, I think, understands the situation. Technically there has been no conference; that is true. Technically there is none and will not be until the conferees are appointed to prepare and submit their formal report to the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JONES. I am perfectly frank, however, in these matters. We thought we could expedite the measure, just as is often the case. So the prospective conferees met and reached a tentative agreement, but that will be submitted in the formal conference report, upon which, of course, the Senate can take such action as it deems wise to take.

Mr. McKELLAR and Mr. COUZENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee, as I think he rose first.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall take only a moment, I will say to the Senator from Michigan. I inquire of the Senator from Washington if it is a fact that the Senate conferees have tentatively agreed to restore section 4 despite the unanimous vote of the Senate striking it out?

Mr. JONES. I think the conferees agreed that their action should be considered as confidential, and I believe very properly so.

Mr. McKELLAR. A statement to that effect was published on yesterday.

Mr. JONES. I am not responsible for that, and I do not know whether the statement as published was correct or not; I paid no attention to it. The conferees, however, will submit the conference report to the Senate for such action as the Senate may see fit to make.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. COUZENS. The tentative conference report seems to have been so generally agreed to that our coalition leader, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], has already approved of it. The Senator from Arkansas is quoted as

saying that he will not interpose any objection to the conference report which will be submitted. The agreement provides that the President shall be given jurisdiction to spend the money appropriated. So we are going through a lot of folderol here; it is perfectly absurd.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. JONES. Having made my motion, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, I rose for the purpose really of making a parliamentary inquiry. Have conferees been appointed?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Not as yet, since the Senate has not as yet agreed to the motion.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Is it the custom, unwritten law, or tradition that prospective conferees shall meet and reach an agreement before they have been appointed?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senator propounds that as a parliamentary inquiry—

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I do.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks the question is more practical than parliamentary, but, at any rate, it has already been answered by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Namely, that before being appointed prospective conferees meet and agree as to what they will do if appointed?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The opening statement of the Senator from Washington was to that effect.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I think I did state that I myself would not feel justified in delaying the final passage of the bill if all the conferees agreed on the restoration of the provision which was stricken out on my motion. If that shall be the status of the report when it shall be brought here, I shall adhere to that position, although I think the amendment was a proper one, and I do feel that the prospective conference committee acted somewhat hastily in receding from the position of the Senate, which, according to my understanding, was taken by a unanimous vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion proposed by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, what is the motion?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] moves that the Senate insist upon its amendments to House bill 14804, accede to the request of the House for the appointment of conferees, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DILL. Would it be in order to make a motion to instruct the conferees to adhere to an amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Oh, yes, indeed.

Mr. DILL. After they are appointed, but not before?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Before the conferees are named.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President—

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington [Mr. DILL] has the floor.

Mr. DILL. I am not sure—I have not the bill before me—of the number of the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, but it is section 4, I think.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is section 4.

Mr. DILL. I move that the conferees on the part of the Senate be instructed to adhere to that amendment in conference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. First of all, the question on the motion to insist on the amendments of the Senate will have to be put.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I inquire what is the legislative effect of adopting a motion insisting on a Senate

amendment which the prospective conferees have already stricken out by mutual consent?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair can not regard that as a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BARKLEY. And the action taken by the prospective conferees does not seem to me to be in accordance with parliamentary procedure, either.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the motion of the Senator from Washington to insist on the amendments of the Senate shall be agreed to, will it then be in order for the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. DILL] to move to instruct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the circumstances, the motion of the Senator from Washington will be divided, and the question will first be put upon the motion to insist upon the amendments attached by the Senate and agreed to by the conference.

Mr. DILL. I understood the answer of the Chair was that my motion was in order, and should be acted on before the conferees were appointed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. DILL. I want to change the wording of the motion, and move to instruct the conferees on the part of the Senate to insist upon the amendment of the Senate striking out section 4.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator can formulate the motion while the Chair is putting the other question.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio will state it.

Mr. FESS. I desire to ask whether instructions at this time would not be regarded as being entirely antagonistic to a conference? Would not such a motion foreclose the idea of an open conference?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not regard that as in the line of a purely parliamentary inquiry, but the Chair will state his own opinion. Frequently Senate conferees go into a conference where they know that the door is closed to a free and open conference—a "full and free conference," in the language of the rules.

Mr. FESS. Is not that universally after the conferees have met and disagreed and come back with a report?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Not always, in the experience of the present occupant of the chair. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, my reason for making this motion—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the junior Senator from Washington please permit the Senate to get to the point where his motion may be made? The question is on agreeing to the motion of the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] that the Senate insist on its amendments, agree to the conference asked for by the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, before that motion is put, I want to point out how perfectly absurd the motion is. The motion ought to be rejected, and conferees appointed who have not already made up their minds and reached an agreement. It is a perfectly absurd procedure to adopt a motion that the Senate insist upon its amendments and appoint conferees, which is, as I understand, the motion pending.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator permit the Chair to suggest that it is within the power of the Senate to name such conferees as it desires?

Mr. COUZENS. That is true; but what I am saying is that the President pro tempore now in the chair has already a list of the conferees to be appointed; those conferees have already met and have reached an agreement, and here we are going through the absurd procedure of voting on a motion to insist upon the amendments of the Senate and appoint conferees, when it is all over with.

Mr. DILL. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. DILL. The Senate can meet that situation by adopting a motion to instruct its conferees. Its conferees are, after all, the servants of the Senate, and we can adopt a motion to instruct the Senate conferees, which they will not be at liberty to disobey.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. DILL. I yield.

Mr. COUZENS. Does not the Senator see the absurdity of such procedure, when the conferees have already made up their minds and agreed?

Mr. DILL. But the conferees of the Senate are the servants of the Senate and are subject to the orders of the Senate.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The junior Senator from Washington has the floor. Does he yield to his colleague?

Mr. DILL. I yield.

Mr. JONES. I should like to state that the whole matter is in the hands of the Senate. When the conference report shall come in, if the Senate is not satisfied with the conference report, it can reject the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is—

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Washington a question before I vote on the motion. I have been told that the statement was made in the Senate before I came in that the prospective conferees, or those who would normally be appointed, have already reached an agreement to yield on the amendment which the Senate placed on the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I want to say that I have always considered a conference report as confidential until it shall be submitted to the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES. The conferees have, as I said a while ago, informally agreed in regard to these matters; but there is as yet no conference report before the Senate, and I do not feel free, at least publicly, to announce what is the tentative agreement.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Washington a question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama has the floor.

Mr. BLACK. May I suggest—

Mr. SIMMONS. I wish to ask the Senator from Washington a question.

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. I want to know if the Senate has actually appointed conferees; that is, if their names were announced by the Chair?

Mr. JONES. No; the Senate has not as yet appointed conferees.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator from Michigan said a little while ago, as I understood him, that conferees had already been appointed.

Mr. COUZENS. Oh, no.

Mr. JONES. The Senator from North Carolina misunderstood the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. SIMMONS. I may have misunderstood him, but I understood the Senator to say that conferees had already been appointed and had acted.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama has the floor.

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. COUZENS. The Senator from Michigan said the conferees who are going to be appointed had already met and agreed.

Mr. SIMMONS. I did not understand the Senator to say "the conferees who were going to be appointed." I was under the impression that they had not been appointed.

Mr. COUZENS. They have not been appointed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Washington, if there have been no conferees appointed, how can there be any secrets? Why can not the Senator tell what was decided upon the other day in the informal meeting?

Mr. JONES. I suppose when members get together and act confidentially that they are practically bound to hold their action in confidence. The Senator from Tennessee and any other Senators here can agree to have a conference amongst themselves and agree to treat it confidentially, and I think if they agreed to do that they would feel bound to observe the confidence.

Mr. McKELLAR. That may be so; but the conferees have not anything in secret for they have not been appointed.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, it is true that no conferees were appointed; Senators all understand that, and there is no use for us to talk about that, for everybody knows it.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Washington a question?

Mr. BLACK. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. CARAWAY. The Senator from Washington says that the presumed conferees have reached an agreement tentatively; but they can not announce it. The Senator, however, comes here and asks the Senate to insist upon an amendment that he knows has already been receded from. The Senator from Michigan inquires what is the use of indulging in a farce. If the Senator from Washington has already made up his mind, why does he ask the Senate to insist upon a disagreement and appoint conferees?

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, of course, the Senator from Arkansas understands that situation just as well as I do. He knows that technically the Senate itself has taken no action.

Mr. CARAWAY. I think that this is the first time such a thing as has been referred to ever occurred, and I hope it will be the last time.

Mr. JONES. Of course, I do not know how often the Senator has been on conference committees.

Mr. CARAWAY. But I never thought of surrendering before I was named as a conferee.

Mr. JONES. I know we have had similar informal conferences such as the one in this case heretofore in order to save time and expedite legislation. That was the sole purpose in this instance. There was nothing, I might say, that was secret about it.

Mr. CARAWAY. Then, if there is nothing secret about it, tell us what the outcome was.

Mr. JONES. There has been no formal action of the Senate or of the Senate conferees. The Senate conferees met together as Senators—

Mr. McKELLAR. But was the action taken as published in yesterday's newspapers? That is what we want to know. Have the newspapers misled us about it, or have they told the truth about it? What are the facts?

Mr. JONES. I will say frankly to the Senator that I did not read what the newspapers said about it.

Mr. McKELLAR. They disclosed it all.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama has the floor.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, I am interested in this matter for more than one reason. I am interested on account of the amendment which has been mentioned, and I am interested also on account of two amendments with reference to appropriations for advances to the State of Georgia and the State of Alabama, although they do not increase the amount of the appropriation at all. May I ask the Senator from Washington if there has been any preliminary agreement between the prospective conferees which would cause the Senate to yield on those two amendments or by which they have agreed to yield on those two amendments?

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I will say that the prospective conferees met and reached a full agreement, so far as they were concerned, with reference to the matters in disagreement. Some items were agreed to as the Senate adopted them and some were not, while others were modified.

I think everybody understands the situation. Everybody understands the urgency of this legislation. The prospective conferees met simply in the interest of saving time and expediting legislation. If the Senate desires to quibble about matters of that kind and withhold action upon this important and very necessary legislation, I am not responsible for that. It is very plain what has been done. There is no attempt at concealment with reference to the action of the prospective conferees, except, as I say, that we considered our action confidential. It was not binding upon the Senate. It was not binding upon any of the conferees, for that matter.

There is the situation. If the Senate desires to delay matters, of course, I am not responsible.

Mr. BLACK. I understand thoroughly that the Senator does not want to conceal anything; but I was interested to know what was the preliminary agreement with reference to those two amendments, and I did not understand the Senator to tell the Senate.

Mr. JONES. As soon as we get the conference report formally before the Senate that will be shown.

Mr. BLACK. There has already been an agreement reached by the prospective conferees?

Mr. JONES. I have announced several times that the prospective conferees have reached a tentative full agreement on all items.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK] has the floor and desires to propound a parliamentary inquiry, which the Senator will state.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, if the Senate now agrees to the motion to appoint as conferees those who have already met and acted preliminary to final action, and the Senator from Washington makes his motion hereafter, will that be subject to an amendment to require that the Senate conferees adhere to all of the Senate amendments?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Certainly.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I desire to ask a question of the Senator from Washington, and it is this:

Did the Senate conferees meet and decide among themselves what should be done, or did they meet with the House conferees and come to this agreement? I do not mean the Senate conferees in the technical sense, when none had been appointed, but the Senators who are entitled under the usual rule and procedure of the Senate to be appointed conferees. Did they meet by themselves, or did they meet in session with the gentlemen who are entitled to be appointed conferees of the House?

Mr. JONES. The prospective conferees of the Senate and the prospective conferees of the House met together.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I desire to say that it seems to me this is the most remarkable proceeding that has ever taken place in the Senate since I have been a member of it.

The Senate expressed its will with reference to this matter by voting to send this amendment to conference. That was an expression of the will of the Senate that the amendment should be eliminated. I am speaking now of the main amendment, the one that cuts down the allowance for relief purposes. Ordinarily, and always, as far as I recall—certainly it has been the custom of all conference committees of which I have been a member, and I have been a member of many—the conferees appointed by the Senate, whatever might be their views about questions, felt that they were bound in duty to the Senate to do what they could to carry out the will of the Senate as expressed, and they have insisted upon that. In this case, however, before they have actually been appointed, they have met and have agreed to surrender the position of the Senate. I say that is very remarkable and very unusual.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I make the motion which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. The Senator from Washington moves that the conferees on the part of the Senate on House bill 14804 be and hereby are instructed to adhere to the amendment striking out section 2 of said bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington [Mr. DILL].

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, is there not some confusion about which section that is? In the bill that we passed I think it was section 4.

Mr. DILL. The motion has reference to section 2 as the bill came over from the House, on page 4.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is all right.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. DILL. I do.

Mr. COUZENS. I ask the Senator if we have not already adopted a motion to that effect.

Mr. DILL. No.

Mr. COUZENS. We adopted a motion to insist upon the Senate amendments.

Mr. DILL. That is different from instructing the conferees to adhere to them.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, may I say a word?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. DILL. I desire to say just a few words, and then I shall have finished.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, will the Senator point out just what section he refers to?

Mr. DILL. I refer to section 2, the provision that reads:

The sums herein appropriated shall be available interchangeably for expenditure on the objects named in this act upon order of the President stating the amounts and the appropriations between which such interchanges are to be made.

Mr. JONES. I thought that was it, but I wanted to be sure. That is amendment numbered 13 in the bill as printed with the amendments numbered.

Mr. DILL. I said the amendment striking out section 2 of the bill as it came from the House.

My reason for making this motion is that unless this section is stricken out, we might just as well write into the beginning of this bill a total amount of money, and say that the President may spend it for these purposes as he sees fit, without making any appropriation of amounts for any particular purpose. It seems to me that such latitude in the exercise of power should never be granted to the President of the United States except in time of great emergency, such as war or a terrible catastrophe that may have come upon the country.

I have no desire in any way to impugn the good faith of the President, or in any way to show a lack of trust in the President; but the Congress of the United States is the constitutional body to make appropriations and to say how they shall be spent. I think the history of the country shows that Congress has consistently retained the power to say for what purposes money shall be expended when it is appropriated from the Treasury of the United States; and no such latitude in the exercise of power has been granted to Presidents except in times of war or of great emergency. This is a fundamental principle of our Government that should be observed.

I do not care to make any lengthy speech about the matter. I simply wanted to explain my reasons for making the motion, those reasons being more particularly a matter of precedent and a matter of maintaining the performance of the constitutional duties of Congress.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, I move to amend the Senator's motion by adding to it that the Senate conferees be instructed to insist upon the proviso that was put in after the word "appropriations," on line 23, page 5:

Provided, That every contract made under the provisions of this bill to which the United States, any Territory, or the District of Columbia is a party, and every such contract made for or on behalf of the United States or any Territory—

And so forth. I do not want to take up the time of the Senate; but that is an amendment that was put on at the end of the bill, and was put on unanimously. I desire to amend the motion of the Senator from Washington so as to include that amendment put on in the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Washington accept the amendment?

Mr. DILL. I will accept the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question, then, is upon the perfected motion of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, as I understand the effect of the motion of the Senator from Washington is to instruct the Senate conferees to insist upon these amendments. That, I take it, destroys at the start any full, free, conference. We are preparing for a deadlock here for three or four days, and in the meantime the bread lines are lengthening.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment. The Senate will have finally to determine whether or not it wants this particular section struck out. Why not make progress by simply following the ordinary procedure, permit the conferees to go out and make the report, and bring it back here and get action from the Senate upon these amendments?

If we send the conferees out with this instruction, we are simply tied up. Under those circumstances the House is not going to yield, so long as there is no free conference. There has been, we will assume, an indiscretion upon the part of our colleagues in the early conference; but that has nothing to do with the merits of this matter. For God's sake, let us get something done in order that we may feed some of these people who are hungry.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I simply wish to say that I would not have made such a motion were it not for the fact that the prospective conferees have already bound themselves to an agreement upon which I want to test the sentiment of the Senate. We might just as well determine it now as at some other time. If the prospective conferees had not taken this action, if they had not done this, I would not make such a motion at this time.

Mr. BORAH. The difficulty is that the Senator is proposing to send the conferees of the Senate back to meet with the conferees of the House when there is no free meeting about it.

Mr. DILL. But they have already had a free meeting. They would be free as to all other amendments anyhow.

Mr. BORAH. We are not accepting any such procedure as that. We are not bound by it.

Mr. DILL. But are not they bound by it?

Mr. BORAH. No; they are not bound.

Mr. DILL. If their word is good, they will be bound.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, as I read this instruction, it is a proposal that the Senate adhere to its amendment. That means that if the House does not accept the action of the Senate, the bill is killed. I suggest to the Senator to put in the word "insist," and then the matter would have to come back to the Senate.

Mr. DILL. We have already insisted.

Mr. SWANSON. That simply means "instructed." The word "adhere" means that if the House vote on the matter, if they do not change their action, that kills the bill. The word "adhere" means that the bill is killed. I ask the Senator to change that word to "instruct" or "insist," because that is the usual parliamentary expression. If one House adheres to an amendment, it simply means that the bill is killed unless the other House concurs; and I am not willing to kill this bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as I remember, the Senator from Washington has already asked to have his motion amended so as to use the word "instructed."

Mr. DILL. I have used the word "instructed."

Mr. SWANSON. That is all right.

Mr. McKELLAR. That ought to settle the whole matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, under the program of the administration, if the action of the conferees which seems already to have been taken in an unofficial way is carried

out by Congress, I desire to inquire of the Senator from Idaho whether any human being will be fed anything out of this fund? As I understand the position of the administration, it desires an appropriation only to feed horses, cows, and hogs. It does not desire any of this fund to be expended for feeding human beings.

Mr. DILL. That is not incorporated in this measure.

Mr. BARKLEY. This is not the bill providing for furnishing food?

Mr. DILL. No.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then I withdraw my inquiry.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, I desire to amend the motion of the Senator from Washington by adding the amendment on page 3, beginning:

Provided further, That the balance of the appropriation of \$1,660,000—

And by adding, at the request of the Senator from Georgia, amendment No. 11, immediately following the one I have mentioned.

I desire to make a statement with reference to something that has been said here about bread lines. If there is any desire to shorten the length of the bread line neither one of these amendments will be stricken from this bill, nor will the amendment of the Senator from Michigan be stricken.

I want to tell the Senate exactly what is happening in my own State with reference to contracts made for public buildings. A contract was made for the building of a post office in Alabama, an appropriation of \$95,000 having been made. Letting the contract to the lowest bidder, it was let for about \$65,000. When the contractors went to the town where the building was to be erected they imported labor at 20 cents per hour. The prevailing wage of common labor in that district is 45 cents per hour. They imported carpenters and bricklayers at 40 to 45 cents per hour, when the local wage is about 90 cents per hour. By that great economy under the present administration, which alleges that it is seeking to shorten the bread line, the Government saved of the appropriation which was made about \$15,000, but it saved it at the expense of the men who were compelled to labor for 20 cents per hour, when the prevailing wage is from 40 to 45 cents per hour for common labor.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, was it saved to the Government or to the contractors?

Mr. BLACK. The contractors evidently secured their part, I would assume; but according to the report made to me from the Post Office Department last week the Government, of the sum which was appropriated, will save about \$15,000 in the program of economy on account of the importing of laborers at 20 cents per hour, when they can not live upon that amount, and save through the importing of brick masons and carpenters at about 40 cents per hour, when the prevailing wage is from 90 cents to \$1.

The amendment of the Senator from Michigan would cure that condition. If it is desired to have the Government continue to beat down the compensation of labor at this time, when the administration is calling upon industries throughout the country to hold up the prevailing standards of labor, then, of course, it is proper for the House to obtain its desire, and it is proper to admit the infallibility of the administration with reference to all legislative viewpoints.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator understand that the unofficial conferees, who have not yet been appointed but who have acted, have agreed among themselves to eliminate this Couzens amendment?

Mr. BLACK. In the announcement which I saw in the newspapers—I can not vouch for its truthfulness—it is stated that that amendment, among others, will fail, and therefore with the Chief Executive of the great Government of the United States calling conferences for the purpose of asking industry not to reduce the returns of labor, we will find that same Government standing for a principle of beating down the wages paid labor in the erection of public

buildings in every section of this country. That is the issue before the Senate at the present time on this motion.

Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. SMOOT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Alabama yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BLACK. I yield first to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Would the Senator be willing to propound to the Senator from Washington an inquiry as to just what action the unofficial conferees have taken?

Mr. BLACK. I have propounded that inquiry, and have not received the information.

I now yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if I understood the Senator correctly, he charges the administration, or the Government of the United States, with beating down labor in his own State, Alabama.

The Senator must know what the law is. When bids are asked by the Government for the erection of a post-office building in the Senator's State, the law requires that the Government shall accept the lowest responsible bid. It has nothing to say in reference to what salaries or wages shall be. What the department wants, and what under the law it is compelled to get, is the lowest bid for doing the work, and that is what it hopes to get.

Mr. BLACK. I understand the Senator's viewpoint, and I do not charge, with reference to the particular contract to which I have referred or with reference to contracts which have heretofore been let, that the administration is beating down the compensation of labor contrary to law.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. BLACK. Let me finish my statement. The Couzens amendment would change that situation. That amendment provides that when a contract is let the highest prevailing wage of labor shall be paid by the Government, and that bidders shall bid with that understanding. Therefore I take the position that those who seek to defeat this amendment are trying to fasten further onto the Government a policy which, at a time when the Chief Executive claims the wages of labor should not be reduced, is beating down the wages of labor in every State in this Union.

The amendment would do this: It would provide that if a contract is let for the erection of a building in Alabama or in any other State the highest prevailing wages shall be paid by the contractor. Under the present law such is not the case. Therefore the issue confronts us squarely this morning, as it confronted the informal conference on Saturday and as it will confront the other conference at a later time, whether we are willing now in this body to stand for a system which is beating down the compensation of labor all over this country at a time when, as the Senator from Idaho has said, the bread lines are waiting for bread. That is the question which arises with reference to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. I am not in sympathy with the defeat of the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan. But I do not think it is good practice, if we want to make time, to instruct our conferees before they go to meet with the conferees on the part of the House, because that would prevent any conference at all, really. What we ought to do is to bring the matter back here and pass upon it, and then when the Senate shall have passed upon it the Senate will have made known its views.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, I understand the Senator's position entirely, and I anticipated, from the Senator's general policy and the line of thought he has always pursued in this body, that he would be in sympathy with the amendment of the Senator from Michigan. But we are caught in this dilemma by reason of what is perhaps an antiquated procedure, of failing to obey the general rule which is set down in Jefferson's Manual that conference committees shall be appointed from those sympathetic with and not antagonistic to the general principles contained in amendments for which the Senate conferees should stand. Here we are with a conference committee already having met before the conferees

are appointed because we adhere to the unwritten rule in the Senate of appointing the senior members of a committee, whether they favor or oppose amendments adopted or not, when we practically know in advance and they do not deny that they have already agreed to yield on this vital amendment at this time, when the bread lines are lengthening day by day throughout this entire country, and the amendment in controversy would prevent the exact situation which has driven down the wages of the men who are compelled to work in order to earn their daily bread.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. JONES. I want to say to the Senator—and I say it frankly—that my personal sympathies are very much along the lines of the principle of the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, if it can be practically carried out. Furthermore, independent of that, it has always been my attitude as a conferee, no matter what my personal views might be, to feel that I am expected to reflect the views of the Senate. I have always stood by that principle and taken action accordingly.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, I appreciate fully the Senator's position, and I am not saying anything in the world that is intended to reflect upon the Senator.

Mr. FLETCHER and Mr. GOFF addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Alabama yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BLACK. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. FLETCHER. It occurs to me, very much in line with the thought of the Senator from Idaho, as I understood his remarks, that the time to raise this question is after a full and free conference has been had and a report made to the Senate. When the report comes in it will be in order then for the Senate either to accept it or to reject it and send the bill back for further conference, with instructions to the conferees. That is the usual course, the usual practice. We will then have a full and free conference, the report will be here, and it will be for the Senate to deal with it after it comes before us. It can accept part of it and send back the rest of it for further conference, with instructions to the conferees. It seems to me that would be the time when the action should be taken.

Mr. BLACK. Under ordinary circumstances I would agree with the Senator fully, although I call his attention to the fact that when the report comes in it comes in as a whole. We are compelled either to be placed in the attitude of voting against appropriations which we think should be made, of standing upon one amendment rather than carrying out the general good to be accomplished by the entire bill. Therefore, on account of that fact, and on account of the further fact that the conferees have already met, that those who will be appointed in the ordinary course of events, as has been said and not denied, have agreed to yield on this particular amendment, along with others, it seems to me that we have an entirely different situation from what we have under ordinary circumstances.

I am free to state that with reference to a part of the Senator's amendment, I was in doubt as to its advisability, and for that reason I voted for the amendment to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin; but with reference to the general underlying principle, it seems to me that it is contrary to every policy which has been announced from the White House with reference to maintaining a standard of labor for us to permit ourselves to yield in advance on a proposition which will determine whether men can hereafter be employed, in these times of stress, when the coercion of need of jobs to earn their daily bread is known to the Senate as it does under the present circumstances.

There is no infallibility about the position assumed by the gentlemen at the other end of this Capitol. It may be that most frequently their votes are in accord with the White House, as has been stated from time to time. But some of us are not even willing to admit infallibility in any one individual, however high may be his position and by whatever vote he may have been elected by the people. We believe

that the Members of these bodies have a right to express their own views in their own way.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. CARAWAY. I hope the Senator will be careful about making any charge, because I understand there has been a sworn band over there formed to resist any attack upon the President. The Senator might rouse them up.

Mr. BLACK. That might be possible. Now I want to call the Senate's attention to another amendment which I have added to this, and to show how that will not affect the bread line.

Last year there was authorized an appropriation of \$1,660,000 to restore roads in my State which had been destroyed by floods. The State is ready to-day to begin work on those roads, but unfortunately they do not have the money to match the appropriation which was voted a year ago. The only effect of this amendment, from which I have understood the committee has agreed to recede, would be to release that money now, at the time when the administration says it desires to have people put to work. The appropriation has already been made. We are usually led to believe that when the conferees from the other end of the Capitol take a position it is in accord with the administration's views. Can it be true that the administration which has promised so much to the people in the last few months, and has had commission after commission appointed to investigate and to plan, is willing to stand upon a denial of the temporary advance of money which can be spent to-day to put people to work in the United States of America?

When the money has already been appropriated and the States are ready to spend it to-day on roads to put people to work, as they are in Georgia and Alabama, what fundamental reason can anyone suggest why we should be compelled to yield and bow down subserviently to those who happen to be in power at some other place, when we have our own conscientious belief that a principle is right?

That amendment proposes no additional appropriation. It is as sound as the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan. Both of them are intended to give practical aid, instead of the aid which was suggested by the Secretary of Agriculture, which came perilously near providing for a dole. Both of them are intended to put people to work with money which the Government will spend at a later date anyhow.

Is it true that now, after we have been informed and it has not been denied, that the conferees who will be selected have agreed in advance to recede from this position merely because some oppose us, we must take it exactly as it is given to us or we must not take it at all? Shall we be silent the first time the question comes up in this body and we have a chance to vote upon it?

These questions are vital and I insist that here and now is the time, because when this matter comes back it will come back, unless the newspaper reports are incorrect—and the prospective conferees have not asserted they are incorrect—with a yielding on these important amendments, the three which have been presented and to one of which I have not adverted, and then we will be compelled to vote upon them as a whole. Some one will then say, "Are you going to delay the appropriation which will shorten the bread line? You will have to take this or you will get nothing."

It seems to me there are enough Senators in this Chamber who, if they combine their real sentiments, will let it be known that there is a militant and aggressive fight to be made in order to carry out their principles and they are not bound to submit subserviently to some principles which are asserted and sent to this body, by which we are told to "take this or take nothing," that if we do anything except what is suggested we are "playing with human misery." Why have we not the right to express our views as Senators in this Chamber and vote those views? If we happen to disagree with some one in another department of the Government are we to sit silently by and accept what is doled

out to us, or shall we assert our prerogative and make a militant fight to relieve the unemployment and distress which is abroad in the land? I sincerely trust this motion will be agreed to.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Alabama if I understood him correctly, that the administration or the Government is favoring the importation of foreign labor into the different States to carry out these contracts?

Mr. BLACK. I shall be glad to answer the Senator. The statement that I made was that under the present law labor is being imported into various localities for the purpose of working at a very cheap wage. Labor is being worked at a price more than 50 per cent below the prevailing wage standard. If the amendment should be agreed to that situation would not continue. If it is true, as generally thought, that the conferees at the other end of the Capitol frequently voice the sentiment of the administration, I do state that the presumption is that if the amendment is stricken out it represents the desire of the administration.

Mr. GOFF. I wish to say to the Senator that apparently he was not in the Chamber on Thursday, the 11th instant, when this very feature was somewhat intimately discussed by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] and by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS], and that I also participated in that debate. The question arose at that time and I unequivocally stated that I favored the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan, and that the Government is not favoring a contractor bringing in labor from the home State where the contractor resides. I have investigated that question personally, and while the Treasury Department informed me that such is frequently the case, they further state what is axiomatically true, that where a contract is let to the lowest responsible bidder the Government could not impose, in the performance of that contract, conditions and obligations which it had no right to require the contractor to agree to at the time he took steps to become the lowest responsible bidder.

The Treasury Department informs me further—and that is an impression which I think does not exist in the mind of the Senator from Alabama—that the Treasury is doing all that it can do to encourage the so-called foreign contractor to go into the State where he is to perform his contract and employ the local labor, and not bring with him or import the so-called floating labor from other States because he might employ their services cheaper or because it might be more agreeable to the performance of his contract in general.

I stated further at that time that I heartily approved of the amendment of the Senator from Michigan. To apply it in a very practical sense, I know of my own knowledge that in several cases contractors from other States have attempted to come into States adjacent thereto and sometimes far away, and that they have found it cheaper from their point of view to import their regular army of labor qualified to perform the feature of the contract which has been awarded to them. I do not believe that that is in the interest of the performance of the contract locally or that it tends to relieve the present depression and unemployment situation which is existing in the country. I know, though, and I do not wish to have the statement made and not have it explained or replied to—that the Government is doing everything within its power to persuade the successful contractor to go into the community where the contract is to be performed and there employ the labor necessary to perform that contract.

I had a case which involved the town in which I live in the State of West Virginia. I went down for that very reason, because the lowest successful bidder came from the State of Indiana, and tried to see if I could have that contractor induced to employ local labor, which was suffering from the general world-wide depression. I was informed by the officials of the Treasury Department having the matter in charge that they were doing all they could within the legal limitations of the contract to induce the successful

contractor not to import his floating labor machine, so to speak, but to employ local labor.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me—

Mr. GOFF. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. The effect and purpose of the object desired to be attained, if written into law, would require the bidder to comply with the specifications rather than his desires in the matter, if into those specifications could be written the proposed requirements relating to the employment of local labor.

Mr. GOFF. If the Senator will turn to page 554 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, he will read there the very language which he has just stated in substance and he will further read the remarks which were made then by the Senator from Michigan and by several others who participated in the debate at that time.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. GOFF. I do.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Does the Senator know of any reason why the Treasury Department can not make the minimum-wage scale a part of the specifications when they ask for bids from contractors? Does the Senator know of any reason why the Treasury Department can not specify the conditions of labor in the specifications?

Mr. GOFF. I would answer the Senator from Minnesota very candidly. I do not conceive that it would be legal for the Treasury Department or any other department of the Government required to let a contract to the lowest responsible bidder to assume to dictate the terms under which the labor was to be employed. These propositions are involved in the general maximum mass sum which is the bid of the lowest successful bidder, and for the Treasury Department to say, "In entering into this bidding you can only be received as a bidder provided you agree to such and such wages of labor," I believe, is a legal proposition which is not proper and I believe it will interfere with the liberty of contract as that term is used and understood in the Constitution of the United States and the constitutions of the several States of the Union.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Does the Senator believe that legislation which would give the Treasury the authority to specify the terms and conditions of labor, as they now have the right to specify the kind of materials and plans for the building to be constructed, would be within the Constitution? Does the Senator think that legislation aimed at giving the Treasury that authority would be within the Constitution?

Mr. GOFF. I do not think that question is involved in the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I know it is not.

Mr. GOFF. I think it is a very doubtful proposition whether it would be constitutional for the Congress of the United States to say to any department of the Government, "If you let this contract, although you are required by the law generally and constitutionally to let it to the lowest responsible bidder within the amount which has been appropriated, you must also require that the contractor agree to pay a certain rate of wages and that he shall agree to buy certain material in a certain locality." I doubt very much that that would be constitutional within the meaning of that term.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I asked the question because the Senator was explaining how far the Treasury Department was making an endeavor to better the condition of labor and wages. I was wondering if they could go that far.

Mr. GOFF. The Treasury Department did inform me, as I stated the other day, and as appears on page 557 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that it would use its best efforts to induce in every way possible the employment of local labor.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. GOFF. I yield.

Mr. JONES. I may say to the Senate that I have no apologies to make for the action of the prospective conferees. I have been a prospective conferee under similar circumstances and have acted in the same way. We were moved only by a desire to expedite action on the legislation. We have not done so by the action taken, I am sorry to say. I am perfectly willing to assure the Senate, if the matter is sent back to conference, that no agreement will be made upon the amendments covered by the motion of my colleague from Washington [Mr. DILL] or the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. COUZENS]. Unless the House agrees to those amendments we shall bring them back to the Senate for further consideration of this body. I make this suggestion in the interest of time and expediting the legislation.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. GOFF. I yield.

Mr. HEFLIN. With that understanding the matter is satisfactory to me. I think the Senate ought to have an opportunity to pass on the question. It is already known how the Senator from Washington stands on it. I do not think we ought to get into a parliamentary situation in the conference which will deprive the Senate of passing on this particular question.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia allow me to ask the Senator from Washington a question?

Mr. GOFF. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. SMITH. Am I to understand that his proposition is that, without any action on the part of the Senate binding the conferees at that time, the Senator from Washington pledges the conferees on the part of the Senate that if the House does not agree to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Michigan he will bring it back to the Senate for further action?

Mr. JONES. If the House conferees do not agree to the different amendments I have named, I shall bring them back to the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Together with the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] striking out section 2 as well as the other two amendments?

Mr. JONES. Yes; I shall bring them back to the Senate.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. President, there is just one thought I wish to express to the Senator from Alabama, and that is this: I do not understand that it is either parliamentary or within the Rules of the Senate to say to the conferees of the Senate when they shall be appointed, "You shall" or "You shall not take this position." The conferees, contrary to what I understand to be the views of the Senator from Alabama, are the mere agents of the Senate; they are not principals in any sense of the word, but are strictly and purely agents. When they meet in conference they carry with them the conclusions reached by the Senate, and the Senate is the principal, so to speak, of the conferees.

At the same time, when they go to the conference, they go there prepared, without any instructions whatsoever, to carry out the authority imposed upon them by their appointment, and when they go to the conference they should be free to exercise at that conference such discretion as they think proper in view of what may be advanced or argued in the conference. Then if the conferees come back with a report which the Senate, as their principal, does not see fit to approve, I thoroughly agree that the conferees may be reinstructed to go back to the conference and take an entirely different position.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOFF. I yield.

Mr. BLACK. I merely wish to state to the Senator that with the statement now made by the Senator from Washington, so far as I am individually concerned, I am satisfied as to what he will do.

Mr. GOFF. I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. DILL obtained the floor.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President—

Mr. DILL. Does the Senator wish to speak on this question.

Mr. SWANSON. No; I merely wish to make a motion in regard to another matter.

Mr. DILL. Then, I will proceed for a moment. My colleague's statement changes the whole situation, as I see it. I am not concerned about my colleague making any apology, but I am concerned that the Senate may know that the conferees on this bill are not bound by any preconference meeting; and I take it from the Senator's statement that, whatever may have been the tentative agreement, it is not to be considered binding by the Senate conferees, and that, if the motion shall be withdrawn, the Senate conferees will not agree either to the amendment the Senator from Alabama has offered being stricken out nor the amendment which I and the Senator from Michigan have covered in my amendment, without bringing it back to the Senate and without a chance for the Senate to vote on the question.

Mr. JONES. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. DILL. With that understanding, I am perfectly willing to withdraw my motion, because I do not desire to set the precedent in the Senate of instructing conferees on a bill of this kind; but the situation was extraordinary and unusual, and I thought, therefore, an extraordinary and unusual remedy might properly be applied. Therefore I withdraw my motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now recurs upon the concluding portion of the motion of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], namely, that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. JONES, Mr. SMOOT, Mr. HALE, Mr. GLASS, and Mr. BROUSSARD conferees on the part of the Senate.

SATURDAY HALF HOLIDAY IN GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

Mr. McKELLAR. I offer a resolution which I ask may be read, and, in connection with it, I ask that there may be printed in the RECORD certain articles by Robert M. Buck in support of the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 369) was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations, as follows:

Whereas Federal statutes provide that the heads of the several executive departments of the Government and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall require seven hours of labor each day of every employee except on Sundays and holidays; that every Saturday after 12 o'clock noon be a holiday in the District for all purposes; and that department heads, including the District Commissioners, may require extension of hours of work, including holidays, only by special order stating the reason; and Whereas since enactment of the law declaring Saturday afternoons holidays, in 1901, but few of the heads of executive departments have dismissed their employees at noon and the Commissioners have not done so; and

Whereas Federal and District employees have thus been compelled to work Saturday afternoons without special orders stating the reason, in apparent violation of the law: Therefore be it

Resolved, That all heads of executive departments of the Government and the heads of all Government establishments not under the executive departments, and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, ordered to report to the Senate whether or not they have required their employees to work on any Saturday afternoons; if so, whether they have supported their action in so doing by issuing special orders stating the reason; and, in the event such orders have been issued, that they submit copies of the same, together with schedules, showing how many and which Saturday afternoons their employees were required to work thereunder.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the articles referred to by the Senator from Tennessee will be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The articles referred to are as follows:

SATURDAY HALF HOLIDAY, LONG IN STATUTE BOOKS, FLOUTED BY GOVERNMENT

By Robert M. Buck

Every Saturday afternoon for 28 years the law has been violated by heads of Federal departments and the District Commissioners. The law says that "every Saturday after 12 o'clock noon is a holiday within the District for all purposes." And the law says department heads shall work their subordinates seven hours every day except Sundays and holidays. It says further that when compelled to make them work overtime or on Sundays or holidays they shall do so "by special order, stating the reason."

This has been the law since 1902, and yet Federal and municipal employees in the District have been required by their chiefs to work extra hours every Saturday after 12 o'clock without special order and without assigning a reason. Even in summer the official Saturday workday illegally ends at 1 p. m., instead of noon, in the Federal departments. The District employees get off at 12.30 in the summer and 3 the rest of the Saturdays of the year.

It is not generally understood that Government clerks used to work six hours a day; but such is the case. On March 15, 1898, Congress lengthened this workday to seven hours by passing the following law:

"Hereafter it shall be the duty of the several executive departments in the interest of the public service to require of all clerks and other employees of whatever grade or class in their respective departments not less than seven hours of labor each day except Sundays and days declared public holidays by law or Executive order: *Provided*, That the heads of departments may, by special order, stating the reason, further extend the hours of any clerk or employee in their departments, respectively, but in case of an extension it shall be without additional compensation."

In 1901 Congress undertook to give Government employees Saturday afternoons off as part compensation for the lengthened hours and included Saturday afternoons in the list of statutory holidays.

Roosevelt then was President, and he did not want employees to be given the half holidays. So he took advantage of the technicality that all the holidays were listed in the statute governing negotiable paper, and held that Saturday afternoon was a holiday only as concerning payment of notes and similar transactions.

Congress, in the following session, amended the law to state that all the statutory holidays, including Saturday afternoons, were holidays "for all purposes." Roosevelt then took refuge in the law of March 15, 1898. Following a Cabinet discussion his Secretary of War asked his Attorney General for an opinion on whether or not they had to let Government workers off on Saturdays.

Acting Attorney General J. C. McReynolds, now on the United States Supreme Bench, wrote the opinion. He gave Roosevelt and his fellow department heads what comfort he could, but it was not much. He said Saturday afternoon was clearly a holiday exactly the same as Christmas or July 4, but that there was no law forbidding a person to work on a holiday nor was there any law "absolutely requiring" departments to be closed and clerks released from work. From that point on he expressed the official opinion:

"1. That every Saturday after 12 o'clock noon is a holiday for all purposes in the District of Columbia and is, therefore, one of the days declared public holidays within the meaning of the statute regulating the number of hours of labor which it is your duty to require of all clerks and other employees of your department. You are consequently not obliged to require labor by such parties after the hour of noon on Saturdays.

"2. Under the law as it now stands you must require at least seven hours' labor of all clerks and other employees in your department every day in the year except Sundays and those days declared holidays by section 1389 of the Code of the District of Columbia and during authorized leave. It is also clear that you have the right and, if in your judgment the interest of the public service demand such action, it is your duty, by special order, stating the reason, to extend the hours of labor on ordinary days as you may think proper and to require of clerks and employees in your department that they work on any or all holidays now established by law during the hours you may designate in such order."

All through the law and the Attorney General's opinion and the documents that have been compiled throughout the 30-year controversy the idea is stressed that the only way Government clerks can be lawfully made to work overtime and on Sundays, on Saturday afternoons and other legal holidays is "by special order stating the reason."

This clearly means that holiday work is to be ordered only as an emergency measure, limited to the duration of the emergency and with the nature of the emergency stated. And yet since the law was passed in 1901 and amended in 1902 Saturday holidays have been withheld from Federal and District employees, and not in a single instance does the record show a "special order stating the reason."

NO RECORD TO BE FOUND OF ANY ORDER DECLARING A "SATURDAY EMERGENCY"

By Robert M. Buck

There is a more-or-less general impression that the reason why Government and municipal employees in the District have been denied Saturday half holidays, to which they are entitled by law, is that President Roosevelt, in 1904 or thereabouts, issued an Executive order declaring an emergency—an emergency that required Saturday afternoon work.

The question often is heard: Why has the emergency been permitted to last 26 years without being questioned? It is an idle question. No Executive order can be found. Existence of an emergency has never been alleged. Under the law and opinions of the Attorney General, Saturday afternoon work can only be exacted by "a special order stating the reasons." There has never been a special order stating the reason.

There is no Executive order in the files of the Civil Service Commission, where orders by the President touching personnel are kept. There is none in the archives of the Department of State, where such orders are prepared. Diligent search has failed to disclose any person who remembers having seen such an order.

The Federal Bar Association has had a committee at work for several months on the subject of Saturday half holidays for Federal employees. This committee has searched for such an Executive order and its members, failing to find trace of it, believe it never existed.

Instead, the only documentary basis thus far discovered for requiring Saturday afternoon work in contravention of the law, lies in two memoranda in the War Department.

In 1903, Mr. Justice Reynolds, then Acting Attorney General, submitted to the Secretary of War an official opinion that Saturday afternoons were legal holidays like Christmas in the District, but that employees could be made to work by "a special order stating the reason." This opinion was concurred in by Attorney General A. Mitchell Palmer in 1919.

The Acting Secretary of War on September 5, 1903, issued a memorandum to bureau chiefs saying that "in the interest of public service" all employees would be required to work until 3 p. m. on Saturdays for the rest of that month and until 4 p. m. thereafter until further order. This was clearly not "a special order stating the reason." It did not describe the emergency.

On January 8, 1904, the Secretary of War issued another memorandum quoting the act of March 15, 1898, as warranting his increasing the hours of labor without extra compensation and saying that "in order more effectually" to administer it, after January 11, 1904, the hours of labor for all employees of the department would be from 9 a. m. to 4.30 p. m. with half an hour for luncheon and that the foregoing would apply to all Saturdays except in July, August, and September, when the hours of work would be 9 a. m. to 1 p. m. with no luncheon period.

This memorandum constituted the origin of the practice of letting Government clerks off at 1 p. m. on Saturdays in the summer. Recently June was added to the months in which Saturday work ends at 1 p. m.

It is clear, also, that this second memorandum did not constitute "a special order stating the reason" and did not set up an emergency.

The other departments and the District government do not seem to have even that little "justification" for Saturday afternoon work. All the District government has to show is a general (not special) order setting forth the work hours each day and assigning no reason.

SATURDAY AFTERNOONS—HOW GOVERNMENT DISREGARDS THE LAW OF THE DISTRICT

By Robert M. Buck

The fact that the law says "every Saturday after 12 o'clock noon is a holiday in the District for all purposes," has been called to the attention of President Hoover several times.

He has been variously quoted as saying that he is in entire accord with the suggestion to grant a half holiday every Saturday, that he is in sympathy with the project, but that the present is not an opportune time, and that "we" (the White House) have the opinion of the Attorney General that under the law of 1898 the President may require Saturday afternoon service in spite of the act of 1902.

Although there are pending in Congress bills to let nearly all Government employees off at 1 p. m. on Saturdays, neither the President nor the commissioners need to wait until such a bill is enacted to let such employees off on week ends in the District. For the law requires them to dismiss employees not at 1 p. m. but at noon every Saturday the year around except in case of emergency, when they may require work by "a special order stating the reason."

One of the bodies which has laid the matter before President Hoover is the Federal Bar Association, which appointed a committee for the purpose consisting of William R. Vallance, Ralph G. Cornell, Edwin A. Niess, George A. Warren, F. C. Baggarly, and Charles W. Flora.

This committee prepared a printed brief on the subject and submitted it to the President last summer. It contains the citations of the law and quotations from the opinion of Acting Attorney General Reynolds in 1903, which have been used in these articles and, in addition, said:

"We are advised that under date of August 15, 1919, Attorney General Mitchell Palmer, in an opinion to the President, concurred with the view of Acting Attorney General McReynolds that the result of the above legislation was to make every Saturday after 12 o'clock noon a public holiday for all purposes in the District of Columbia, and within the meaning of the statutes regulating the number of hours of labor which it is the duty of heads of the departments to require of all clerks and other employees of their departments. So far as we can ascertain, no Attorney General has dissented from these views."

The brief also quoted the courts as sustaining the point. In *Ocuppaugh v. Norton* (24 D. C. App. 97) (says the brief) Mr. Justice Morris, of the District Court of Appeals, said:

"The substitution of the words 'for all purposes' in the amendatory act of June 30, 1903, has been generally understood and accepted as broadening the scope of this provision so as to make it apply to all official duty and to justify the cessation of all official work. It seems to be accepted on both sides of these cases as constituting the afternoon of Saturday as a dies non juridicus."

The Court of Claims is also quoted as declaring Saturday afternoon a holiday for all purposes. The association then speaks for itself and says, through its committee's brief:

"The Federal Bar Association not only concurs in the interpretation of the law above set forth but is of the opinion that the

words 'shall be holidays in the District for all purposes,' constitute a mandatory provision making it obligatory upon executive branches of the Government to observe the Saturday half holiday the same as Christmas, New Year's, Thanksgiving, Fourth of July, and other holidays described in the same act.

"While this provision (authorizing extra work) clearly authorizes the executive heads by special order stating the reason to extend the hours of labor on ordinary days and to require labor on any and all of the holidays specified in the code, it is our view that such action can lawfully be taken only in case of emergency and for temporary periods during which such emergency may continue. In the absence of a pressing public necessity declared in a special order, a full compliance with the law requires that all holidays established by law should be observed."

SATURDAY AFTERNOONS—HOW GOVERNMENT DISREGARDS THE LAW OF THE DISTRICT

By Robert M. Buck

The States are more generous to their employees than the Federal Government, according to data collected by William R. Vallance, president of the Federal Bar Association and head of the committee which prepared the brief of Saturday holidays.

Vallance has been getting information from the States on what they do in the matter of Saturday afternoon closing. He sent out a questionnaire and received replies from 45 of the 48 States. Only three States work their employees every Saturday afternoon. They are Idaho, Montana, and Nevada.

Thirty-two States let their employees off every Saturday afternoon, and 18 of them do it without any law compelling them to. Two of the States let their employees off Saturdays in the summer only, as does the Federal Government. The other eight let part of them off every Saturday.

The States in which employees are given Saturday half holidays by law are California, Delaware, Indiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia.

In the following States employees are released Saturday afternoons without legal compulsion: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

In the summer the employees of the States of Washington and New Mexico are given Saturday afternoons off. Eight States extending Saturday half holidays to part of their employees the year around reported as follows:

Colorado, force greatly reduced; Illinois, law applies to departments under civil-administrative code, not to State officers generally, although nearly all of them get off; Kansas, most departments grant half holiday, although not required by law; Kentucky offices close at 1 p. m., except in counties of less than 150,000 population, as required by law; Louisiana, law requires noon closing metropolitan parishes and towns exceeding 6,000; Nebraska, employees of elective and code offices given half holiday by law; Oregon, each department, board, or commission decides for itself; Texas, half of employees of each department excused at noon alternately, as regulated by the appropriation bill.

The States not heard from were Connecticut, Iowa, and Utah.

SATURDAY AFTERNOONS—PRINCIPLE OF SATURDAY HALF HOLIDAY FINDS MANY SUPPORTERS IN HIGH PLACES

By Robert M. Buck

There is pending before Congress a bill to give Federal (including District) employees, with a few exceptions, every Saturday afternoon off beginning at 1 o'clock.

This is a desirable bill for the benefit of those working elsewhere than in the District. It is not necessary for those working here because the law already directs that they be let off every Saturday afternoon. Since the present law has not been obeyed by the administrative branch of the Government there is no guarantee that a new one would.

Furthermore, the new law, if obeyed, would rob District resident employees of one hour every Saturday, for the existing law says they shall get off at noon, while the pending bill specifies 1 o'clock.

The bill originated in the Senate. It was introduced by Senator JONES (Rep., Washington). It originally provided that four hours constitute a day's work on Saturdays throughout the year, with pay for a full day, for "all laborers, helpers, skilled and semi-skilled workmen and mechanics, exclusive of employees of the Postal Service and the Government Printing Office."

The bill, thus benefiting laborers and mechanics, with the exceptions noted, passed the Senate. In the House Committee on Civil Service it was amended to include all civil employees of the Government and the District except those in the Postal Service, the field service of the Department of the Interior and the Panama Canal on the Isthmus.

Government Printing Office employees are covered in the bill in its present amended form. Thus changed, the bill is still on the House Calendar. If passed by the House it will go back to the Senate for concurrence in the amendments. The Senate probably will agree.

Postal employees are covered by a similar bill introduced by Senator LA FOLLETTE (Rep., Wisconsin). It passed the House yesterday.

President Hoover has asked the Budget Bureau to compile the cost of the bill in additional pay-roll expenditure, if any. The

Bureau of Efficiency has aided the Budget Bureau in the investigation.

The results of this probe are not publicly known. District Auditor Donovan has informed the investigators that practically no added expense will be entailed in the District service. This rather sweeps the ground from under the feet of the commissioners for keeping employees at work in violation of the law.

The report of the House committee says the Civil Service Commission and the Comptroller General are in favor of the new bill. This would seem to imply that they favor the principle of Saturday afternoons off, and that they, therefore, are not in favor of ignoring the existing law. Yet they continue to do so. They do not let their own employees off on Saturdays.

It is not necessary, so far as those employed in the District are concerned, for department heads or the commissioners to wait for enactment of the pending bill to shut up shop on Saturday afternoons. For them to begin now to obey the Saturday holiday law would in no wise endanger the passage of the bill for the benefit of those working in the States. In fact, it might give the bill an impetus.

MODERNIZATION OF BATTLESHIPS

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, several days ago the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] made a motion, which is now pending, to reconsider the vote by which there was passed a bill authorizing the modernization of three battleships. The Senator from Utah is now present, and I am anxious to have the matter disposed of.

The bill referred to involves merely an authorization and does not make an appropriation. It is necessary for us to modernize our battleships if our Navy is to be equal to the British Navy. Two ships will be completed in March, and unless this authorization shall be made early in the present session, thousands of men will be thrown out of employment in the navy yards for lack of work. This matter should be disposed of quickly, and I ask that the motion be now considered, so that action may be taken, and the authorizations made, and that the work may be proceeded with. Of course, the Committee on Appropriations will not be able to act until the authorization shall be made.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon will state it.

Mr. McNARY. Have we concluded morning business?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business has not as yet been concluded. Resolutions are in order. The action desired by the Senator from Virginia can only be taken by unanimous consent.

Mr. McNARY. Then I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SWANSON. The motion to which I have referred will come up after the consideration of resolutions that have been previously gone over, will it not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will not come up automatically. The Senator from Utah can deal with his motion whenever he chooses, whenever the regular order shall have been disposed of.

POSTMASTERS AT MARIETTA AND CEDARTOWN, GA.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, one of the nominations reported to-day by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS] is that of postmaster at Marietta, Ga., whose husband was a United States Senator, one of the very best men who ever represented the State of Georgia in this body. I refer to Mrs. Alexander S. Clay.

Another nomination, which has been reported by the Senator from Colorado, is that of Mrs. Anna K. Bunn for postmaster at my home town, Cedartown, Ga. They are both reappointments. Both ladies have served for many years and have made excellent records. My colleague from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and I have approved them. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations may be considered now as in executive session and confirmed.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I dislike to object, but I have always asked that nominations be considered regularly in executive session, and I shall have to ask that the nominations go to the Executive Calendar.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the Senate always approves the nomination of a United States Senator without referring

it to a committee. As I said, the nomination in one case is that of a widow of a former United States Senator. She has been holding the office for 12 or 16 years; she has made a splendid record; and I hope the Senator from Washington will not object to the consideration of that nomination, nor to the nomination of postmaster at my home town.

Mr. DILL. I have no objection at all to confirmation in the cases referred to by the Senator from Georgia, but if I did not object in this instance, when some other nomination was called up in which I am interested, I would be told that I would not be taking the same procedure that was adopted in another case. I ask that the nominations go to the Executive Calendar.

Mr. HARRIS. Whenever the nomination of a United States Senator comes here I do not think any Senator on this floor objects, and I hope the Senator from Washington will withdraw his objection in these two cases.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands the Senator from Washington to maintain objection. Objection is made, and the nominations will go to the Executive Calendar.

WORLD COURT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR DILL

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, on the 13th day of the present month the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. DILL] delivered an address over a nation-wide radio hookup, in which he discussed certain phases of the proposal that we adhere to the World Court on the basis of the so-called Root formula. I ask unanimous consent that his address may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Last Monday evening General Harbord spoke over this radio network in favor of the entrance of the United States into the League of Nations court. Last Wednesday the President officially asked the Senate to approve such a proposal. To-night I shall discuss, first, General Harbord's remarks and, second, the documents which the President has asked the Senate to approve.

General Harbord declared that a majority of the American people favor adherence to the League of Nations court. He based his conclusion on the fact that "the voice of two-thirds of the daily press of the United States" had said "yes" to a questionnaire which Edward Bok's League of Nations propaganda organization, the American Foundation, recently sent to the editors of the daily press of the United States.

Of course, one opinion is as good as another as to just how accurately the opinions of newspaper editors represent public opinion on a great international question such as the League of Nations court. Suffice it to say that the people are as likely to vote against a newspaper editor's opinions as they are to vote for those opinions. Most of the editors who now indorse the League of Nations court also indorsed the League of Nations covenant in 1920, which, of course, included the court. When the American people voted on that question, they voted "no" by 7,000,000 majority.

Just how many of the editors have carefully examined the terms of the documents which the President has sent to the Senate for ratification I do not know. I do say, though, that if they have relied upon the interpretation placed upon those documents by the American Foundation and by General Harbord their opinions can not be considered of much value. Both the American Foundation and General Harbord take the position that the Senate's fifth reservation and the new proposal now before the Senate are practically the same, when in fact they are entirely different. What is that difference?

When the Senate adopted the resolution of ratification of the League of Nations court protocol five years ago, January 27, 1926, it attached five reservations, the essential parts of which are as follows:

First. That the United States would establish no legal relation to the League of Nations nor incur any obligation under the treaty of Versailles by joining the court.

Second. That the United States would help elect the judges of the court.

Third. That the United States would help to pay the expenses of the court.

Fourth. That the United States could withdraw from the court and that the protocol could not be amended without the consent of the United States.

Fifth. That the court could not render an advisory opinion on any subject if the United States objected.

When President Coolidge submitted those reservations to the members of the League of Nations, what happened? The European statesmen who run the league immediately accepted the first four reservations but they refused to accept the fifth. Let me read that reservation in full. It is as follows:

"That the court shall not render any advisory opinion except publicly, after due notice to all states adhering to the court and

to all interested states and after public hearing or opportunity for hearing given to any state concerned; nor shall it, without the consent of the United States, entertain any request for an advisory opinion touching any dispute or question in which the United States has or claims an interest."

What is the history of this reservation? How did the Senate happen to adopt it? The record of the Senate debate shows that Senator SWANSON, the chief proponent of the court at that time, offered it the day before the vote was taken in the Senate. It represented the deliberate, considered judgment of those who favored entrance into this court five years ago, after Senators had debated the subject in committee and on the floor of the Senate for many months. The Senate was practically unanimous in its support of this reservation. The President approved. The press of the country declared it a wise and proper reservation, because it gave the United States the right to protect whatever interests might be involved in decisions of the court.

Every other great nation had then and has now the right as members of the league to prevent consideration by the court of any case to which they make objection, but these nations now refuse to grant that right to the United States. If the United States were a member of the League of Nations, it would possess that right, but because it is not a member of the league it is to be denied that right.

In other words, the European statesmen who run the League of Nations and control the League of Nations court now say to us: "You may come into the court with us, you may sit with us, you may vote with us, you may pay bills with us, but you shall not interfere with us, you shall not have equal rights with us, you shall not prevent decisions about your affairs being made by us."

You may have noted that I refer to this court as the League of Nations Court instead of as the World Court. I do that because this is not a world court at all. A world court would be a court created by the nations of the world to decide cases only in accordance with terms of international law; but the League of Nations wrote the law that established this court. The League of Nations determines what subjects this court shall consider. The League of Nations elects the judges of this court. The League of Nations pays the salaries of those judges. The supreme law of this court is not international law but the Covenant of the League of Nations.

The League of Nations created it. The League of Nations controls it. The League of Nations maintains and guides it. I repeat it is not a world court but the League of Nations court.

When the American people voted by 7,000,000 majority to stay out of the League of Nations they meant to stay out of the court of the league as well as out of the council and the assembly.

Surely if we are to enter the court at all, it should be only on conditions that will fully protect American rights. Had we joined the league as President Wilson urged, our rights in the court would have been protected, as are the rights of all league members, but the people vetoed that at the polls. Both President Harding and President Coolidge believed adherence to this court should be on a basis of equality with other nations. When the league refused to accept the fifth reservation Mr. Coolidge said: "I do not intend to ask the Senate to modify its position. Unless the requirements of the Senate resolution are met by other interested nations, I can see no prospect of this country's adhering to the court."

The American people approved that statement. No Member of the Senate expressed disagreement. It remained for Mr. Hoover to propose surrender. He excuses this proposed surrender in the name of peace. Millions of the American people and many Senators and Congressmen are willing to close their eyes to all objections and dangers, because of their hope that the court will maintain peace. League of Nations propagandists and followers of the international bankers have made them believe this League of Nations court will prevent war. They hope this League of Nations court is the international machinery that will insure permanent peace. But let us examine this proposal.

The greatest contribution the United States can make to world peace is, first, to remain at peace itself, and second, to use its vast influence to keep other nations at peace. The United States covets no territory. Our people will not start war to secure trade in other parts of the world, or to enforce our form of government upon any people. About the only causes for which the American people will fight are interference with the rights of our Government and its citizens within our own borders, or upon the high seas, and for the maintenance of human liberty under law.

If we enter the League of Nations court, without the power to protect our own rights against interference by that court, as was provided in the fifth reservation, we are sowing seeds of international trouble that may easily lead to war.

Let me illustrate the danger of such action. Take the immigration question. Suppose a nation proposes that all bars to immigration be abolished in all countries, and asks the court to pass upon the question. We could object, and the court would consider our objections. If it decided to pass on the question anyhow, we could withdraw. Then we might find ourselves in the position of having the League of Nations court, of which we had just been a member, making a decision on the question of immigration which affects our national existence more than any other question at this time. Under the fifth reservation, if some nation brought forth such a proposal, and we objected, that would be the end of it. Under which arrangement do you think the future of America would be best protected? Under which arrangement would there be less likelihood of international complications which might lead to war?

Take the question of canceling the war debts: If some nation proposed the court should render an opinion on the question of the cancellation of all war debts, and the United States objected, and if the court decided to consider the question anyhow, we could withdraw. If the court decided the war debt should be canceled, and that is the sentiment of Europe generally to-day, we would find the League of Nations court deciding all war debts should be canceled, and the United States would be pictured as leaving the court because we feared the court would cancel the debts. Under the fifth reservation, if such a proposal were made the United States could object, and that would prevent the court's consideration of the proposal to cancel the war debts. Which arrangement do you think would best protect American rights? Under which plan would there be less likelihood of international complications that might lead to war?

I have used these two illustrations because they are questions that are pressing and imminent in international affairs at this time. Nobody can foresee what new questions may arise in the years that are ahead; but, with the guarantees of protection afforded by the fifth reservation, at least the United States could protect its rights and future interest without offense to other nations. Under the Root formula all it could do would be protest, and if the protest were overridden, it would mean withdrawal from the league court of which it had previously been a member. This would inevitably lead to international resentment and make war far more probable than had we never entered the League Court.

The issue before the Senate and the country now is whether the Senate will insist upon the guarantees of protection to American rights provided by the Swanson reservation or accept the Root surrender. Newspaper reports to the effect that there is practically no opposition to the adoption of the Root formula for adherence to the League of Nations court are but a part of the propaganda to discourage all opposition to the proposal. The truth is that the opposition to this proposal is far more formidable than was the opposition to the court in 1926.

There are at least 25 Senators now opposed to adherence to the court under the Root formula. At least 12 or 15 more Senators are in doubt as to the wisdom of surrendering the Swanson fifth reservation for the Root substitute. The court enthusiasts voted cloture by a two-thirds vote in 1926. They can not do that to-day. They have not sufficient votes.

We who are opposed to the President's proposal do not intend to try to prevent a vote by filibustering, but we do intend to insist upon full consideration of the proposed surrender of the power to protect American rights. We expect and believe the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations will hold full hearings, not only by hearing Secretary Stimson and Mr. Root but also by hearing noted jurists and public men who understand the real effect the Root formula will have. We hope the committee will call John Bassett Moore, a great American international lawyer, who served on this court, to explain his views of the Root formula. Then we intend to have a full and free debate in the Senate, at the close of which, I confidently believe, more than one-third of the Senate will support the Swanson reservation rather than the Root surrender.

MINUTES OF TARIFF COMMISSION

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I submit a Senate resolution and ask that it may be read. In the absence of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] I will not press it to-day but will ask that it lie over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 370), as follows:

Resolved, That the United States Tariff Commission be, and is hereby, requested to submit to the Senate a certified copy of the minutes of the meetings of the commission from January 28, 1927, to December 1, 1930, inclusive, and that these minutes be printed as a public document.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I will say, for the RECORD, that all of the minutes of the Tariff Commission have been printed since 1922 except for the period designated in the resolution. I assume that there will be no opposition to action upon the resolution when I have a chance to confer with the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will lie over under the rule.

TAXES PAID BY NEW YORK STOCK EXCHANGE AND MEMBERS THEREOF

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 366, which was heretofore introduced and went over under the rule.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 366) submitted by Mr. HEFLIN on the 10th instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby requested to transmit to the Senate the information showing the amount of taxes paid to the Government by the New York Stock Exchange or by members thereof in connection with exchange transactions for the years 1919, 1920, and each succeeding year up to and including the year 1930.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am informed that the information called for by the resolution is available to any Senator who may make inquiry. It does not require that a resolution be passed by the Senate. I think the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] a few days ago objected to the consideration of the resolution, and I would rather not have it acted upon in his absence.

Mr. HEFLIN. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] asked me to let him have time to look into it. It has been four or five days since the resolution was presented. I do not know that he now has any objection to it. I can not see why any Senator should object to the resolution.

Mr. MOSES. He not being in the Chamber, in his absence, I will object for him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, one of the main reasons why I desired this information is that to-morrow I am going to discuss the New York Stock Exchange; and this subject will be presented to the Senate regardless of whether I get this information or not. I will say that for the benefit of the Senator from New Hampshire.

INVESTIGATION BY TARIFF COMMISSION

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 371), as follows:

Whereas the United States Tariff Commission was directed by Senate Resolution 325, under the authority conferred by section 336 of the tariff act of 1930, and for the purposes of that section, to investigate the differences in the costs of production of cigarette books, cigarette-book covers, and cigarette paper in all forms, and of any like or similar foreign articles: Therefore be it

Resolved, That such direction as to cigarette books, cigarette-book covers, and cigarette paper in all forms be hereby rescinded.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, the Tariff Commission and all parties in interest desire to have this resolution adopted; and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. What is the resolution?

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, do I understand that we passed an order asking the Tariff Commission to investigate this subject?

Mr. COPELAND. Yes; on my request. We find on investigation that practically nothing in this line is made in the United States.

Mr. HARRISON. So everybody is agreed that the Tariff Commission ought not to hold an investigation?

Mr. COPELAND. Yes; and the resolution is to save the Tariff Commission the expense and trouble of going into this subject.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not understand the Senator. Is it true that formerly he asked for an investigation of this subject by the Tariff Commission?

Mr. COPELAND. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. And now the Senator desires to rescind that order?

Mr. COPELAND. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. Has the investigation been made?

Mr. COPELAND. No; the investigation has not been made, and the Tariff Commission and the parties in interest have no desire to go forward with the matter. Therefore I am asking the Senate to rescind the action which it took on my request.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I hesitate to object to the request of a Senator, but in view of the fact that the

Senate ordered this investigation, it seems to me Senators ought to have an opportunity to look at the resolution and to investigate it a little. Therefore I ask that it go over under the rule.

Mr. COPELAND. I have no objection at all, except that I remind the Senator that I myself made the request originally; and it is found now, on investigation, that practically nothing in this line is made in our country, so it would be simply an unnecessary expenditure of time and money on the part of the commission to go forward. I have no objection at all, however, to the matter going over if the Senator so desires.

ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE CLERK

Mr. BINGHAM submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 372), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to employ an assistant executive clerk to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$1,800 per annum until otherwise provided by law.

THE WORLD COURT

Mr. GILLET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a summary of the attitude of the press toward the World Court.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DAILY PRESS THROUGHOUT THE COUNTRY ON RATIFICATION OF THE WORLD COURT PROTOCOLS

A survey of the editorial stand of 2,036 daily newspapers throughout the country with reference to their attitude toward ratification of the World Court protocols has been completed by the American Foundation.

One thousand six hundred and seventy-six editors or publishers responded directly by signed card, letter, or telegram to the following inquiry: "Does your paper favor or oppose ratification of the World Court Protocols?" Eighteen papers are included in the summary on the basis of editorials, which are quoted. Only 6 per cent of the papers of the country, so far as combined circulation is concerned, failed to reply to the inquiry.

The result of the inquiry shows, as the figures below demonstrate, that two-thirds of the daily newspapers of the country—two-thirds, both as to number of papers and as to combined circulation—advocate ratification.

The tabulated result in all classes is:

Favorable, 1,357 daily newspapers with a total circulation of 26,993,906.

Opposed, 265 daily newspapers with a total circulation of 10,557,317.

No stand, 58 daily newspapers with a total circulation of 549,177.

Impossible to classify, 14 daily newspapers with a total circulation of 432,242.

No reply, 342 daily newspapers with a total circulation of 2,564,400.

Total of daily newspapers, 2,036.

Total circulation, 41,097,042.

The 1,357 that favor ratification include practically all the large papers of the country except those noted below in the opposition. While a complete list of the 1,357 is impracticable here, it includes:

From the South the favorable list includes: The Atlanta Constitution, the Birmingham Age Herald, the Mobile Register, the Montgomery Advertiser, the New Orleans Times-Picayune and the Item Tribune, the San Antonio Express and the News, the Louisville Courier Journal, the Chattanooga News and the Times, the Raleigh News and Observer, the Memphis Commercial Appeal, the Richmond Times Dispatch and the News Leader.

From New England the papers editorially advocating ratification include: The Bangor Commercial, the Boston Transcript and the Herald and the Post, the Christian Science Monitor, the Springfield Republican, the Providence Journal and the News-Tribune, the New Haven Register, the Hartford Courant, and the Times.

From the Middle Atlantic States: The Baltimore Sun, the Washington Star and the News, the Wilmington Journal, the Morning News and the Every Evening, the Philadelphia Public Ledger, the Inquirer, the Bulletin, and the Record, the Pittsburgh Press, the Newark Evening News, the Syracuse Post Standard, the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, the Buffalo News, the Times, and the Courier Express, the New York Herald Tribune, the World, the Telegram, the Graphic, the Evening Post, and the New York Times.

From the Middle West and West (except the three Pacific States): The Cleveland Plain Dealer, the Indianapolis Star, the Chicago Post and the News, the Cincinnati Times Star, the Minneapolis Journal, the St. Paul Pioneer Press and Dispatch, the St. Louis Post Dispatch and the Globe Democrat, the Nebraska State Journal, the Omaha World-Herald, the Des Moines Register, the Denver Rocky Mountain News and the Post, the Montana Standard, the Arizona Republican, the New Mexico State Tribune, the Arkansas Democrat and the Gazette, the Milwaukee Leader and the Journal, the Oklahoma City Times and the Daily Oklahoman, the Wyoming State Tribune and State Leader, and the Salt Lake City Deseret News.

From the three Pacific States: The Los Angeles Times and the Express, the San Francisco Chronicle and the News, the Portland Oregonian and the Oregon Journal, the Spokane Spokesman Review, the Tacoma Ledger, the News Tribune and the Times, the Seattle Star.

The following chain papers indorse ratification: The 26 Scripps-Howard papers in 26 cities in 13 States; the 16 Gannett papers in 13 cities in 3 States; the 9 McFadden papers in 9 cities in 4 States; the 6 Brush-Moore papers in 6 Ohio cities; the 4 Shaffer papers in 4 cities in 2 States; the 8 Booth papers in 8 cities in Michigan; the 9 papers of the Southern California Newspapers, Associated; the 5 papers of the News League in Ohio and Florida.

The 265 opposed papers have a combined circulation of 10,557,317. Three-fourths of this combined circulation figure, however, is contributed by 32 papers of the 265 opposed. The 32 are: The 24 Hearst papers in 13 cities, with the New York Daily Mirror, the Chicago Tribune, and the New York Daily News, the New York Evening Sun, the Kansas City Star and Times, the Washington Post, and also the St. Louis Times and the Cleveland News.

A summary of the returns for each State is herewith added. It will be noted that in 9 States no paper whatever is registered as opposed; and in 10 others only one paper is opposed.

State	Favorable		Opposed		No stand		Impossible to classify		No reply		Total number of papers in the State
	Number of papers	Circulation	Number of papers	Circulation	Number of papers	Circulation	Number of papers	Circulation	Number of papers	Circulation	
Alabama	11	298,322	1	1,446	2	7,944			8	27,845	22
Arizona	10	62,614	2	19,358	1	2,325			4	10,396	17
Arkansas	27	157,541			1	680			5	13,099	33
California	106	1,268,477	34	1,069,291	4	11,077			14	61,549	158
Colorado	22	288,125	1	2,490					6	9,529	29
Connecticut	25	384,434			2	7,179			5	62,720	32
Delaware	3	54,378									43
District of Columbia	2	162,334	3	290,961							5
Florida	30	286,113	4	20,872	2	8,282			5	66,337	41
Georgia	20	335,061	1	66,872					5	20,325	26
Idaho	6	30,628	4	24,565	1	4,410			5	13,922	16
Illinois	56	1,136,207	24	2,016,769	8	64,304	3	23,478	31	316,150	122
Indiana	48	572,461	24	175,330	4	36,498	2	6,312	21	262,139	99
Iowa	34	626,844	8	100,124	1	4,775			2	3,122	45
Kansas	33	347,932	7	36,891	1	3,175	1	3,342	12	31,173	54
Kentucky	24	405,572	1	21,507					4	28,668	29
Louisiana	10	252,796			1	39,353	1	20,866	4	64,341	16
Maine	9	138,385			1	32,292	1	18,716			11
Maryland	10	424,597	1	151,914					3	15,430	14
Massachusetts	48	1,764,630	9	534,931	2	7,321			13	129,852	72
Michigan	43	940,859	6	376,657	2	10,861	2	240,531	11	51,254	64
Minnesota	20	509,464	4	19,798	3	147,134			7	117,632	34
Mississippi	13	94,410							2	5,528	15
Missouri	41	1,029,075	5	619,218	1	1,231	1	17,825	13	24,831	61
Montana	11	70,816	4	16,883					4	15,764	19
Nebraska	12	244,190	7	160,689					4	14,934	23
Nevada	5	10,973	2	4,978					2	4,236	9
New Hampshire	7	30,818	2	32,125							9
New Jersey	32	774,181	5	80,997	1	7,000			2	5,300	40

State	Favorable		Opposed		No stand		Impossible to classify		No reply		Total number of papers in the State
	Number of papers	Circulation	Number of papers	Circulation	Number of papers	Circulation	Number of papers	Circulation	Number of papers	Circulation	
New Mexico	5	22,112	1	756					4	27,558	10
New York	115	4,319,527	20	3,227,607	8	84,813	1	25,283	9	284,838	148
North Carolina	23	305,482	1		4	11,605			8	47,806	36
North Dakota	7	63,001	2	8,580	1	4,175					10
Ohio	80	1,959,351	13	510,523	1	6,520	1	73,562	39	319,329	134
Oklahoma	26	418,503	4	88,968	2	4,271			13	49,244	55
Oregon	19	284,010	4	115,317	2	8,739			1	4,421	26
Pennsylvania	106	3,613,345	24	309,097	2	12,059			26	219,994	158
Rhode Island	9	222,951							1	3,447	10
South Carolina	12	144,154	1	2,098					2	7,094	15
South Dakota	12	87,870	1	826					3	5,614	16
Tennessee	19	615,178	1	2,091					3	12,736	23
Texas	78	1,039,467	8	68,626	1	3,172			25	106,402	112
Utah	4	115,108	3	16,038							7
Vermont	7	51,755	2	8,833							9
Virginia	23	370,910							6	22,524	29
Washington	23	456,183	8	137,841	1	4,930			3	40,954	35
West Virginia	23	222,064	4	28,169	1	3,117	1	2,327	2	5,400	31
Wisconsin	34	566,648	9	232,821	2	9,765			3	19,452	48
Wyoming	4	18,350							2	1,470	6
	1,357	26,993,906	265	10,557,317	58	549,177	14	432,242	342	2,564,400	2,036

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, the protocols for American adherence to the World Court are again before the Senate. A statement by FREDERICK H. GILLET, a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, published in the New York Times on December 7, gives a comprehensive exposition of the protocols, and discusses the questions at issue in an exceedingly able manner. I ask permission to have Senator GILLET'S views on this subject printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of December 7, 1930]

AMERICA AGAIN WEIGHS THE WORLD COURT—SENATOR GILLET EXPLAINS THE PRESENT STATUS OF THE LONG NEGOTIATIONS OVER OUR MEMBERSHIP AND THE MEANING OF THE PROTOCOL INTENDED TO REMOVE THE DIFFICULTY OVER OUR RESERVATIONS

(The protocols for American adherence to the World Court are again the subject of debate in Washington. What is the nature of the three treaties, particularly the one accepting the American reservations, and their effect on the position of the United States as a member of the court? The following article by Senator GILLET, a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, gives a comprehensive exposition of the protocols and discusses at length the questions at issue.)

By FREDERICK H. GILLET, Senator from Massachusetts

Never a very simple question, the World Court has been more than ever complicated in the public mind by the technicality of the negotiations that have accompanied the question of our adherence. It is asking a good deal of the casual reader or observer to keep the lines of definition clear as to a subject in which legislative and diplomatic aspects have been so curiously blended. It is now as impossible to get a clear view of the court situation by merely studying its latest phase—that is, by merely scanning the three treaties providing for America's membership—as it would be to get the whole of a complicated continued story by picking up the isolated last chapter.

It has often been suggested that in the course of these negotiations between the United States and the signatories mistakes have been made by both sides. Perhaps they have been; they usually are in a world of men. If they have, all of those mistakes have necessarily been incorporated into the texture; and so the solution that is now proposed is, and must be, peculiarly dependent upon what has gone before. It has to follow the record; and a recognition of this, a frank adoption of a historical point of approach, is an absolute necessity to a fair scrutiny of the present proposal as to how the difficulties are to be adjusted.

THREE TREATIES

Two of the three protocols or treaties awaiting ratification have not an essential bearing upon the particular points to be adjusted between the United States and the member nations of the court. These two should, of course, be ratified as a part of the whole procedure of our adhering to the court; but our own case is wholly covered by the third protocol alone. The two which we do not need at the moment to consider are, first, the protocol of signature of the original statute of the court (1920), signed by every nation that adheres; and, second, the protocol covering certain amendments proposed to be made in this original statute of the court. Most of these amendments are in the direction of tightening up the court's organization—in ways that do not in the least concern our position. The one amendment that does bear upon our position is the addition to the statute of a new chapter (ch. 4) on advisory opinions—the original statute does not mention advisory opinions—and this new chapter is important in making the statute explicit with regard to them and in providing

that the court is henceforth to be guided in the giving of advisory opinions by the same principles that govern it in giving its actual decisions. The court in practice and by its own pronouncement (in the Eastern Karelia case) had observed this policy, but it is, of course, a gain to have the principle thus written into the statute itself.

The fact that the last article of this new chapter 4, article 68, would make the consent of the parties necessary in advisory cases as in actual lawsuits does meet, in part, the position we took in our fifth reservation. But before this amendment was formulated the committee of jurists had already covered the ground covered in article 68, and more, in the special agreement with us contained in the third treaty—which I hope to make clear below. And this special agreement with us has, of course, the same force as the statute.

CUBA'S HESITATION

The fact, therefore, that these amendments to the statute are not yet in operation (though signed by 52 states and ratified by 31) is not at all in point. No part of the adjustment of our situation depends upon their being in force. I have found, however, some misunderstanding on this point, and a confused tendency to feel that since Cuba was not willing to have the court amendments go into effect, perhaps our own action on any of the protocols should be delayed.

The real reason why this is not true is, as I have said above, that the guaranties of article 68 are already secured in the special treaty with us, the so-called "accession protocol." None of the causes of delay in reference to the revision of the statute is related to our case. The amendments Cuba objects to are not those concerning advisory opinions, but some of those in which we have not been interested—notably, the amendment that would force the court to be in constant session. No state has interposed, so far as I know (certainly Cuba has not), any objection whatever to the amendments referring to advisory opinions. And even Cuba has not really finally refused to ratify the revision protocol.

The whole project to have the amendments in operation by September 1 was a little irregular and had nothing to do with us. Of course, the usual requirement would be that every state concerned would have to ratify the amendments before they could go into effect. But since the general election of judges—the first since the election in 1921—was due last September, it was thought advisable to have the amendments in effect by last September 1, if possible, especially since some of the amendments changed the number of judges from 11 to 15, abolished the deputy judges, retrained the judges from following other occupations, etc.; in other words, directly affected the question of election of judges. And so the revision protocol included a somewhat radical proposal that even if all the countries had not ratified by September 1 the amendments could go into operation then, provided that those States that had not formally ratified would make it clear that they felt no objection to the amendments becoming effective.

Cuba objected, with special reference to the amendment requiring the judges to be constantly at The Hague, and also on the ground that this provision for having the amendments go into operation in advance of formal ratification by all the states was not wise. But all this has really nothing to do with us.

AMERICAN SAFEGUARDS

Our whole case is covered in the third protocol accepting our reservations and outlining the procedure needed to make them operate. In this we have all the guaranty contained in article 68 of the proposed amendments and considerably more, and it is important to recall here that the Senate's fifth reservation asked for more. It aimed to prevent an advisory opinion upon a claim of interest, as well as upon the undoubted possession of an interest.

This fifth reservation, around which the controversy has centered, provided that the court shall not "without the consent of

the United States entertain any request for an advisory opinion touching any dispute or question in which the United States has or claims an interest." The League of Nations, through its council or assembly, has the right to ask the court for an advisory opinion on any subject, just as in our State of Massachusetts the legislature has the right to ask our Supreme Court for such an opinion. This Senate reservation obviously aimed to protect the United States from any possible embarrassment resulting from an advisory opinion. No such embarrassment could possibly result from an actual judgment of the court, because, under the statute, the court has no original jurisdiction and can not bind us by any judgment unless we have voluntarily submitted the case to its consideration. The fifth reservation secured us the same protection as to advisory opinions, and made certain that no decision affecting us should be made, under the guise of an advisory opinion, without our consent.

I think the other nations might well have accepted this reservation unconditionally. I do not believe they would ever want to ask for an advisory opinion to which they knew we objected, nor do I, on the other hand, believe that we would ever claim an interest and refuse our consent to an advisory opinion except upon such good grounds that they would, upon reflection, abandon their purpose even if we had no power to prevent it. In brief, I do not think the reservation was important either to us or to them.

EQUAL RIGHTS TO MEMBERS

But nations, like individuals, are often kept apart by mere punctilio. Since in the fifth reservation we had been very exacting in asserting and defining our position, we can hardly complain if the court members responded with an equal explicitness in defining theirs. No other nation had the same unquestioned right which we were claiming (although at the time of the Senate debates we thought they had, on the theory that a unanimous vote was needed for requesting an advisory opinion, and that therefore any one member of the council or assembly had always the power to defeat a request for an advisory opinion), and, consequently, they were not willing to concede to us this exclusive power of absolute veto, although in all probability it would be a theoretical right not likely ever to be exercised. They were willing to assure us a position of complete equality but not of special privilege.

The committee of jurists thought that the best way of resolving the difficulty was to get down to cases and outline just what the procedure, under the fifth reservation, would be in any given case. The treaty now before the Senate is the result. It merits detailed examination, for it is a careful attempt to outline from point to point what will actually happen in any concrete case.

The new treaty is an express acceptance of all our reservations, exactly as passed by the Senate, subject only to certain agreements as to procedure. The only terms as to which there is any controversy are those which prescribe the procedure when an advisory opinion is contemplated. It should be taken into account here that, even if the fifth reservation had been accepted outright, some arrangement as to such procedure would have been necessary in order to insure us an advance knowledge of the prospective opinion, afford us opportunity to determine whether it would affect us, and to secure us a method of seasonably presenting our objections to the court. The present treaty does that; it also recognizes that for the sake of amity and good feeling it is desirable, both for us and for the other nations, that we should know early when the request for an opinion is being agitated in the council or the assembly.

THE PROCEDURE DEFINED

The treaty provides that when any proposal for requesting an advisory opinion of the court is made in the council or the assembly of the league its secretary shall notify the United States, and thereupon there shall be an exchange of views between the proponents of the request and us as to whether an interest of ours is affected. Moreover, whenever a request for an advisory opinion comes to the court it shall notify the United States, and if for any reason there has been no sufficient opportunity for an exchange of views between us and the league, and we notify the court that the question affects our interest, the court shall stay proceedings for a period sufficient to allow the exchange of views.

If no agreement can be reached by this exchange of views, and we still object to the court's rendering the opinion, and the league still insists upon it, then the treaty recognizes that the United States, thus finding itself at wide variance with the court members in the league as to the proper purposes of advisory opinions, would probably wish to avail itself of the right we explicitly claim in our fourth reservation to "withdraw from the court at any time." In the stately language of the treaty, "the exercise of the powers of withdrawal provided for in article 8 hereof" (that is, in article 8 of the protocol, accepting our fourth reservation and defining the procedure for it) "will follow naturally without any imputation of unfriendliness or unwillingness to cooperate generally for peace and good will."

In other words, if ever a crisis should come when we can not convince the members of the council that the opinion would affect our interests prejudicially and that therefore we can not consent to it, and when they can not convince us that it is harmless to us and so important to them that they must persist in it despite our objections, then an impasse is reached, and we can amicably exercise the right to withdraw from the court, covered in our fourth reservation, and resume the position we hold to-day. While we remain in the court no opinion affecting us can be rendered against our objection. Thus the aim of the fifth reservation is achieved.

COURT'S RIGHT OF REFUSAL

There is, moreover, another contingency further lessening the possibility of any final breach. In the unlikely assumption that the league might not agree with us that we are "interested," and might persist in asking the court to give its opinion, the court itself could refuse to give it and support us in our contention. For the court decided in the Eastern Karelia case that when the league asked it to give an opinion which affected the interest of a State which refused to participate in the hearing the court would decline to act on the ground that it has no jurisdiction over a State against its will. The court said:

"It is well established in international law that no State can, without its consent, be compelled to submit its disputes with other States either to mediation or to arbitration or to any other kind of pacific settlement. * * * The court, being a court of justice, can not, even in giving advisory opinions, depart from the essential rules guiding their activity as a court."

By that precedent the court would decline to render an opinion to which we objected if it found that we were justified in claiming that our interests were affected. This makes it still more unlikely that a situation would ever arise when we should feel compelled to withdraw from the court.

I do not believe there is the slightest chance that this ultimate resort of withdrawal will ever be reached. The steps that must precede it almost preclude the possibility. In most of the contemplated advisory opinions the United States will probably have no interest. Of the 16 advisory opinions rendered by the court in the eight years of its existence there is not one which we would have the slightest desire to recall.

OUR POWERS OF PERSUASION

Let us assume, however, that the council is considering requesting an advisory opinion which we think would affect us adversely; the outstanding probability is that our remonstrance would persuade the other powers, and that they would not prosecute their purpose against our wishes. Or they might change the project in such a way as to relieve it of the features objectionable to us, and still attain their purpose or a part of it. Or we might be convinced by them that the danger or injury to us was insignificant compared with the beneficial effect the contemplated advisory opinion would have upon the peace or stability of the world, and so we might withdraw our objection.

I do not believe we will ever press an objection which is not so reasonable and convincing that the league will yield to it and abandon their purpose, or which is not so reasonable that if they are stubborn the court will sustain us. I do not believe the league will ever think an opinion so essential to them that they will press for it against our protest and at the cost of driving us from the court.

We all recognize to-day that conference, negotiation, time, in international affairs, are the safest assurance of agreement. We have negotiated with many nations treaties to insure a cooling-off period, in case of dispute, as offering the best hope of peace. And so here we may confidently expect that this provision for time and consultation will inevitably lead to agreement. But if it should not, if the improbable should happen, if both sides should be persistent and unyielding and a breach were inevitable, even then, in that most unlikely event, we should be no worse off than we are to-day, for we can simply exercise the right we reserved to withdraw from the court, no unfriendliness can be imputed to us, and we resume toward the court the position we hold to-day.

PROTECTION FROM EMBARRASSMENT

And here we may well bear in mind that we have now no protection from embarrassment through an advisory opinion affecting us except the moderation and good sense of the League of Nations. If we were in the court, the council would certainly be no more likely to ask an advisory opinion which would concern us than it is now. On the contrary, with the powers of protest and withdrawal secured to us under the fifth reservation and the treaty accepting it and outlining how it will work we would, as a member of the court, be vastly better equipped to protect ourselves from embarrassment through an unwanted advisory opinion than we now are.

I hope I have made it clear that it is extremely improbable that the exchange of views provided for in this treaty would ever fail to bring an agreement or that the final possibility of withdrawal from the court would ever be resorted to. There is another contingency that further diminishes the probability: It is suggested in the paragraph of this treaty which provides that "there shall be attributed to an objection of the United States the same force and effect as attaches to a vote against asking for the opinion given by a member of the League of Nations in the council or in the assembly." In other words, if any one member of the council (or assembly) could by its protest prevent a request for an advisory opinion, the United States can do the same.

UNANIMOUS VOTE REQUIRED?

The trouble is that it has not yet been determined whether a unanimous vote is necessary for requesting an advisory opinion or whether it may be requested by a mere majority—and whether the court would take cognizance of a request voted by a mere majority. When we formulated this fifth reservation in 1926 we were under the impression that a unanimous vote was necessary, so that any nation in the council (or assembly) had exactly the same veto power we were asking for ourselves. But the league advises us that the question of whether a unanimous vote is necessary has never been tested; that it might ultimately be determined that only a majority and not a unanimous vote is needed; and

that if the fifth reservation were unconditionally accepted the United States would thus be the only nation which by its own action could prevent an advisory opinion.

Many feel that the simplest way out would have been for the league or the court just to establish now that a unanimous vote is necessary. I think that the question will some day be decided, and that when it is the necessity for unanimity will be established. It is certainly significant that in every case thus far the vote for requesting an advisory opinion has been unanimous.

I do, however, understand why a decision on this point can not easily be had now, however much it would suit our purposes to have it. In the first place, there is a sharp difference of opinion among jurists and statesmen as to whether under article 5 of the covenant of the league, requesting an advisory opinion, is a substantive matter requiring unanimity or a procedural matter requiring only a majority. Into the whole question are tied considerations very important abroad and not at all related to us or the question of our adherence. Moreover, many people feel that, however desirable it may ultimately be to have the question clearly settled, the settlement ought not to be on a moot case or under pressure of a special unrelated circumstance such as the question of our adherence.

SENSITIVENESS ABROAD

In short, this is a question upon which the nations abroad are divided and sensitive, for reasons that have nothing in the world to do with us. It seems to me not at all fitting for us to press a point which would result chiefly in arousing dissension over there. The question is obviously not yet ripe for decision. I repeat my own conviction as to how it will ultimately be settled. But even if that decision as to unanimity is long deferred, not only do we have under this treaty the same amount of power to veto that is now possessed by any member of the council or assembly, but also, by this treaty and the fifth reservation which it accepts, the court is restrained from giving, and the league will therefore not request, an advisory opinion in a case in which our interest is admitted.

The real opposition to this treaty is not dissatisfaction with the procedure suggested for the fifth reservation; it is unwillingness to enter the court on any terms. The fact that the judges are chosen by the two constituent bodies of the league and paid through its treasury has been exploited to make the whole project unpopular. By continual reference to "the league's court," persistent attempt is made to attach to the court question the prejudice and hostility that have surrounded the question of our entering the league.

But, of course, adhering to the court does not make us in any sense members of the league. And to prevent any remote suspicion that it might, the first reservation (accepted by the pending treaty) specifically provides "that such adherence shall not be taken to involve any legal relation on the part of the United States to the League of Nations or the assumption of any obligations by the United States under the treaty of Versailles." Language could not be more explicit or conclusive. It seems to me that there is malice as well as confusion in directing against the World Court the hostility which exists against the League of Nations.

THE COURT AND THE LEAGUE

To those who wish we were now active members of the league, the fact that this court has connection with it will not be an objection. To the most relentless opponents of our joining the league, the proposal to support this court should not be disquieting. Personally, I am glad we are not in the league; our geographical location and our racial differences would, I consider, seriously hamper our usefulness in it. But, despite its defects, the league has for 10 years been the most effectual agent for peace and the reconstruction in Europe. By bringing into constant conference the antagonistic and irritated interests of Europe, it offers the best hope of future peace. And, although I do not wish to join it, I wish it well in its efforts. We have cooperated with it in a great many cases, when it was endeavoring to promote the harmony and progress of the world, as in the conferences on traffic in arms, on abolition of import and export prohibitions and restrictions, on slavery and forced labor, on economic statistics, on the control of opium. I hope we shall continue to cooperate whenever thereby the cause of humanity or justice or peace can be furthered.

The mere fact that this court comes from the league and is favored by the league does not prejudice me against it. When the league, following the lead of the United States in The Hague conventions, adopting the spirit and the letter of American statesmen, formulates this enlightened plan for a World Court, our duty as well as our instinct is to welcome it with gratitude and with hope.

MODERNIZATION OF BATTLESHIPS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Resolutions coming over from a previous day are in order.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, as I stated a few minutes ago, a resolution has come over connected with the reconsideration of the bill passed by the Senate authorizing the modernization of three battleships. The Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] entered the motion to reconsider. I should like to have that motion disposed of now, and I think the Senator is willing to withdraw it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. As I understand it, that motion is not in order until the morning business has been concluded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No.

Mr. SWANSON. I do not think there is any objection to it. I think the Senator from Utah is willing to withdraw the motion.

Mr. KING. No, Mr. President, I am willing to have it considered as soon as it can be considered.

Mr. SWANSON. Very well.

INVESTIGATION RELATIVE TO CONVICT LABOR IN THE PRODUCTION OF TIMBER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be stated.

The legislative clerk read Senate Resolution 351, submitted by Mr. STEIWER on the 3d instant.

Mr. STEIWER. That may go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will go over.

THE PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT ON RELIEF LEGISLATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate another resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be stated.

The legislative clerk read Senate Resolution 363, submitted by Mr. LA FOLLETTE on the 9th instant, as follows:

Whereas millions of American citizens are in destitute circumstances due to unemployment and face privation and suffering; and

Whereas the President of the United States, in a public statement, has indicated that consideration for the interests of income-tax payers necessitates restriction on governmental relief measures necessary to aid the jobless and their dependents: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that the relief of human suffering in this emergency should take precedence over the consideration of the interests of wealthy income-tax payers.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, there being but 25 minutes remaining of the morning hour, it is obvious that it would be impossible to get even a fair consideration of the merits of this resolution. I therefore ask that it go over without prejudice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution goes over without prejudice. The morning business is closed. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, I desire to suggest that we might take up the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation bill. I do not think it will lead to much discussion. I believe it can be disposed of rather promptly. I do not know of any measures on the calendar that are particularly pressing. We have gone over the calendar several times recently.

Mr. McNARY. I ask unanimous consent that we dispense with the consideration of the calendar and proceed with the consideration of the Treasury Department appropriation bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fess	Kendrick	Schall
Barkley	Fletcher	Keyes	Sheppard
Bingham	Frazier	King	Shipstead
Black	George	La Follette	Shortridge
Blaine	Gillett	McGill	Simmons
Blease	Glass	McKellar	Smith
Borah	Glenn	McMaster	Smoot
Bratton	Goff	McNary	Steiwer
Brock	Goldsborough	Metcalf	Stephens
Brookhart	Gould	Morrow	Swanson
Broussard	Hale	Moses	Thomas, Idaho
Bulkley	Harris	Norbeck	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Harrison	Norris	Townsend
Caraway	Hastings	Nye	Trammell
Carey	Hatfield	Oddie	Tydings
Connally	Hawes	Patterson	Vandenberg
Copeland	Hayden	Phipps	Wagner
Couzens	Hebert	Pine	Walcott
Cutting	Heflin	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Dale	Howell	Ransdell	Watson
Davis	Johnson	Reed	Wheeler
Deneen	Jones	Robinson, Ark.	
Dill	Kean	Robinson, Ind.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, this being the appropriate day for the consideration of the calendar, and several Members having expressed to me a desire to review the calendar briefly between now and 2 o'clock, and objection being made to my request. I withdraw it.

MODERNIZATION OF BATTLESHIPS

Mr. KING. Mr. President, several days ago a measure was passed through the Senate, S. 4750, to authorize alterations and repairs to certain naval vessels. I was not in the Chamber at the time the bill was called to the attention of the Senate. A number of other Senators were not here who, as I was advised, desired to make some observations in regard to the bill. I therefore entered a motion to reconsider, and that motion is now pending. I am willing now to call up the motion for determination by the Senate.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President, I dislike to object; but can we not go on with the calendar? We have only 20 minutes left.

Mr. KING. I feel under obligation to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] to call up that matter to-day. He has been waiting here for several days for the purpose of having it considered. If the bill is to be passed—and by any statement I make I do not mean to indicate that I am for it—it should be passed as speedily as possible. Therefore I feel under obligation to call up the matter for the Senate to pass upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Utah that this being Calendar Monday, the motion to reconsider can come up only by unanimous consent.

Mr. KING. Or by motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; not by motion; only by unanimous consent.

Mr. KING. Then I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the motion to reconsider which has heretofore been entered with respect to Senate bill 4750.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HOWELL. If it is going to lead to debate, Mr. President, I shall have to object.

Mr. KING. I can not promise with respect to that. I do not know.

Mr. HOWELL. Then I shall have to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Do I understand that we can not now move to take up for consideration a motion to reconsider?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On Calendar Monday it would have to come up by unanimous consent.

Mr. SWANSON. When will it be in order to make the motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Any other morning except Monday.

Mr. SWANSON. I should like to know what Senators want to discuss it. The bill is simply to carry out the policy that has been pursued for the last 10 years. Why it should be stopped now I can not understand.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SWANSON. Yes.

Mr. KING. I ask unanimous consent—we have just called a quorum, and I think it is in order—that this motion be made the special order immediately after the convening of the Senate to-morrow, and that it be taken then from the table and brought up for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, in the absence of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], who has left the floor momentarily, I object, and ask that the request be renewed when he returns to the floor.

Mr. SWANSON. I understand that it will be in order as soon as the morning business is finished to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be.

Mr. SWANSON. I give notice that as soon as the morning business is finished to-morrow I shall move that this matter be disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. After the morning business is closed and the calendar is called the Senator can make the motion. The clerk will state the first bill on the calendar.

THE CALENDAR

The first business on the calendar was the bill (S. 168) providing for the biennial appointment of a board of visitors to inspect and report upon the government and conditions in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 76) to amend Rule XXXIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to the privilege of the floor, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 551) to regulate the distribution and promotion of commissioned officers of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 49) authorizing the Committee on Manufactures, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to investigate immediately the working conditions of employees in the textile industry of the States of North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 153) granting consent to the city and county of San Francisco to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Bay of San Francisco from Rincon Hill to a point near the South Mole of San Antonio Estuary, in the county of Alameda, in said State, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ODDIE. I ask that that may go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 119) authorizing and directing the Committee on Interstate Commerce to investigate the wreck of the airplane *City of San Francisco* and certain matters pertaining to interstate air commerce was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 255) for the promotion of health and welfare of mothers and infants, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill, being the unfinished business, will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 9592) to amend section 407 of the merchant marine act, 1928, was announced as next in order.

Mr. COPELAND. That may go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1278) to authorize the issuance of certificates of admission to aliens, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. COPELAND. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 149) for the relief of unemployed persons in the United States, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PHIPPS. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

MOTOR TRANSPORTATION IN THE ARMY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 23) to regulate the procurement of motor transportation in the Army, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter in procuring motor vehicles for the public service the Secretary of War is hereby authorized, with any price limitations fixed by Congress, to award the contract to the bidder that the said Secretary finds to be the lowest responsible

bidder offering to furnish the motor vehicles that will, in the judgment of the said Secretary, most advantageously meet the requirements of the Government.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, does the Senator from Pennsylvania desire to have the bill taken up at this time?

Mr. REED. I wish we could take it up and pass it. It is a very simple bill.

Mr. KING. I have no objection; but I wish the Senator would explain the bill.

Mr. REED. The present rulings of the Comptroller General require the War Department to accept a bid from the lowest bidder, who has to meet only very general specifications. The Army wants, if possible, to make more definite specifications, because the officials find that under the present practice they have such a wide variety of trucks and passenger cars which are used for the same purpose that they have to keep in stock an enormous quantity of spare parts, far more than would be necessary if they could limit the vehicles to a few types. They do not want to get away from competitive bidding, but they want to narrow down their specifications and write them themselves according to military needs, instead of having the Comptroller General say that any car that would cost \$5,000, for example, is eligible to bid. It is all in the interest of saving money and cutting down the stock of spare parts.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, is there a unanimous report of the committee?

Mr. REED. There is.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recur to Senate Joint Resolution 149, for the relief of unemployed persons in the United States. I have agreed with the chairman of the committee that that joint resolution should be recommitted to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the joint resolution will be recommitted to the committee.

CHANGE OF DATE OF INAUGURATION

The resolution (S. Res. 245) providing for the appointment of a committee to inquire into the failure of the Speaker of the House of Representatives to take some action of Senate Joint Resolution 3, relative to the commencement of the terms of President and Vice President and Members of Congress, was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

PUBLIC ROADS IN LATIN AMERICAN REPUBLICS

The bill (S. 120) to authorize the President to detail engineers of the Bureau of Public Roads of the Department of Agriculture to assist the governments of the Latin American Republics in highway matters was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

THE MERCHANT MARINE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7998) to amend subsection (d) of section 11 of the merchant marine act of June 5, 1920, as amended by section 301 of the merchant marine act of May 22, 1928.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if it is humanly possible to pass this bill before 2 o'clock, I do not want to take any time. I do wish, however, to make a statement emphasizing the importance of the measure.

The purpose of this legislation primarily is to correct a situation under which Federal funds are loaned for ship-building purposes at the present time at as low a rate of interest as 1.7 per cent, because of the fact that the wording of the law requires that the rate shall be the lowest rate of yield upon any contemporary Government security. The net result is that the rate of yield which attaches to the short-time financing of the Government is necessarily the criterion which affects loans to the shipping people under the shipping law. As a result the Government is forced to lend

money for 20 years upon the basis of a purely temporary rate, and the purpose of this legislation, earnestly recommended by the Treasury and by the Shipping Board, is to require that the minimum rate shall be 3½ per cent.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, is that the only question involved?

Mr. VANDENBERG. There is one other question involved.

Mr. KING. I think the bill ought to be passed if that is the only question involved.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The only other question is respecting the so-called period of inactivity when a ship is being built. Under the interpretation of the Comptroller General the builder of a ship has not had the benefit of the low rate of interest during the period of construction. It is generally agreed that he should have it during that period. That is corrected. But fundamentally the purpose of the legislation is the original purpose which I have described.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I think the Senator is agreeable to the amendment on line 14, the insertion of the words:

Provided, however, That on all contracts hereinafter entered into the interest rate shall be paid.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am perfectly agreeable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, amendments 1 and 2 have been heretofore agreed to. The pending amendment of the Committee on Commerce is on page 2, line 19, to add the words "exclusively and under enrollment" after the word "operated."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COPELAND. I move an amendment to the committee amendment on page 2, line 14, before the word "as," to insert a colon and the words "*Provided, however, That on all contracts hereinafter entered into the interest rate shall be,*" so that the amendment will read:

Provided, however, That on all contracts hereinafter entered into, the interest rate shall be as fixed by the board, but not less than 3½ per cent per annum.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, I find that the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] proposed an amendment to this bill on June 17 last, which was printed and is lying on the table. May I inquire of the Senator from Michigan what disposition has been made of that amendment?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am not familiar with it. Will the Senator indicate its purport?

Mr. BRATTON. It is quite a long amendment. It purports to be a proposed section 2 of the bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am not familiar with it.

Mr. BRATTON. In view of the fact that the Senator from Tennessee is not in the Chamber, I suggest that the bill go over.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I think the amendment to which the Senator from New Mexico has called attention has reference to another bill. There is no section 2 of this bill.

Mr. BRATTON. But this amendment proposes the insertion of another section, to be known as section 2.

Mr. FLETCHER. Is it an amendment to this bill?

Mr. BRATTON. Yes; to House bill 7998.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will not the Senator withhold his objection a moment?

Mr. BRATTON. Certainly.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator was not in the Chamber when I made my original statement regarding the bill this morning, was he?

Mr. BRATTON. I think not.

Mr. VANDENBERG. This is purely an emergency matter, recommended by the Treasury Department and the Shipping Board to save the Government from the necessity of lending money to shipping companies at 1½ per cent interest, which is the lowest rate of yield on temporary financing, whereas the intent of the law originally was to give them only the

benefit of the lowest rate of yield upon average and permanent investments. The proposal now pending would lift the rate of interest charged against loans to shipping people from 1½ per cent, as at the present time, to a minimum of 3½ per cent, and those loans are being made almost every week, and the loss is very serious and will be serious unless something is done about it.

Mr. BRATTON. I agree with the purpose of the bill, but I am unwilling to have the bill passed in the absence of the Senator from Tennessee, inasmuch as he has an amendment to offer to it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator will see that the amendment suggested by the Senator from Tennessee has no relationship to the particular subject of the pending bill. It is a totally different and additional subject, which he can quite as well offer to several other merchant marine measures which are on the calendar.

Mr. BRATTON. I agree with that, but the Senator from Tennessee saw fit to propose the amendment to this bill; he is absent from the Chamber, and I think we should not pass the bill during his absence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over, under objection.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Michigan that he perfect the bill, with all the amendments which have been agreed to, except the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee is not pending; it has not yet been offered.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Michigan that I shall offer two other amendments, to make the maximum 4 per cent and to restrict the period of the loan to 10 years.

MERGER OF GASLIGHT COMPANIES

The bill (S. 4066) to authorize the merger of the Georgetown Gas Light Co. with and into the Washington Gas Light Co., and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HOWELL. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

MOTOR TRANSPORTATION IN THE ARMY

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I came into the Chamber just a moment after Order of Business 488 had been called. I have been objecting to the passage of that bill for very good reasons. I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] is not in the Chamber at present. He was here during the consideration of the bill and the matter was discussed at the time the bill was being considered. In view of the fact that the Senator from Pennsylvania is not in the Chamber at this time, I ask that the Senator defer his request and make it later, when the Senator from Pennsylvania may be here.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania is quite well informed that I am opposed to this bill. I happened to be out of the Chamber just at the moment when the matter was called up, and the Senator from Pennsylvania was in the Chamber when I returned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. BINGHAM. I ask that it go over until the Senator from Pennsylvania returns.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I do not want this matter to go by default. I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator enter the motion, or make the motion to reconsider?

Mr. BLAINE. I enter the motion for reconsideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be entered, and can be acted upon at any time later.

THE MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator from Michigan to the fact that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] is now in the Chamber, and I

make no further objection to the consideration of House bill 7998, providing for amendment of the merchant marine act. I merely wanted to prevent its passage during the absence of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOWELL. I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next bill on the calendar.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3229) to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the southern district of New York was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over. The bill (H. R. 699) to prevent fraud, deception, or improper practice in connection with business before the United States Patent Office, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over. The bill (S. 1916) to amend section 1025 of the Revised Statutes of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. BRATTON. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over. The bill (S. 4357) to limit the jurisdiction of district courts of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. COPELAND. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

NATIONAL PROHIBITION

The bill (S. 3344) supplementing the national prohibition act for the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], I understand, desired to be here when this matter was taken up. It will precipitate considerable discussion, and I ask that it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 3558) to amend section 8 of the act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes, approved March 4, 1913, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask that the bill be read.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

WELFARE OF MOTHERS AND INFANTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 255) for the promotion of the health and welfare of mothers and infants, and for other purposes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS] desires to take up an appropriation bill, and for that purpose I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 14246) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fess	Kendrick	Schall
Barkley	Fletcher	Keyes	Sheppard
Bingham	Frazier	King	Shipstead
Black	George	La Follette	Shortridge
Blaine	Gillett	McGill	Simmons
Blease	Glass	McKellar	Smith
Borah	Glenn	McMaster	Smoot
Bratton	Goff	McNary	Steiwer
Brock	Goldsborough	Metcalf	Stephens
Brookhart	Gould	Morrow	Swanson
Broussard	Hale	Moses	Thomas, Idaho
Bulkley	Harris	Norbeck	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Harrison	Norris	Townsend
Caraway	Hastings	Nye	Trammell
Carey	Hatfield	Oddie	Tydings
Connally	Hawes	Patterson	Vandenberg
Copeland	Hayden	Phipps	Wagner
Couzens	Hebert	Pine	Walsh, Mass.
Cutting	Heflin	Pittman	Watson
Dale	Howell	Ransdell	Wheeler
Davis	Johnson	Reed	Williamson
Deneen	Jones	Robinson, Ark.	
Dill	Kean	Robinson, Ind.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. PHIPPS. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that the bill be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, I am going to ask that section 4, which relates to salaries in the classified services, be the first section taken up, although it does not appear first in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BUSINESS OF THE SESSION

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, much has been said and more has been written about the proffer and acceptance of cooperation on the part of both sides of this Chamber, and I desire very briefly to address myself to that and other phases of the existing situation.

When the statement by seven eminent Democrats was first made I regarded it not only as most courteous but as a highly patriotic announcement, and the succeeding weeks have but confirmed that opinion. After consultation with the President and others I framed a reply to it in which, so far as I had authority to represent my colleagues, we offered also to enter into a harmonious arrangement by which the program could be carried out and needed legislation speedily enacted.

My idea of leadership is to put the program through with just as little talk as is necessary to satisfy legitimate debate. When the other day the honorable Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], leader of the minority, rose in his place and made what I consider to be a notable address, I did not respond or follow, and I went about among my fellow Senators and insisted that they should make no speeches upon the subject, as I wanted his effort to stand out as the great contribution of that day, not to be detracted from by other utterances. I want to see action and not to hear words. Therefore I have not been in favor of miscellaneous speech making in the face of an exigent and emergent situation such as confronts us at this hour.

It is said that the program of cooperation has fallen through. Mr. President, in so far as I am aware of the situation, such a statement is far from the fact. I have the old-fashioned idea that, in accordance with the Constitution, it is the province of the President to make recommendations and the province of the legislative body to consider them and to act upon them. We can either alter them or amend them or reject them, but his right to recommend remains the same. Therefore his authority as

the Chief Executive to suggest a program for our consideration remains unchallenged.

The first part of the offer was that there should be no filibustering on appropriation bills. That has not been put to the test, and yet I imagine that it will be accepted in good faith on both sides of the Chamber. I can not conceive of any Senator indulging in a filibuster against a bill to supply funds necessary to keep one of the departments of government running, and particularly at a time when all the departments of government should be functioning more efficiently than ever before in any peace period in our entire history. No such intimation has been given on the part of any Senator, and I can not imagine that anyone harbors in his heart or mind any such thought or purpose.

The next proposal was that we should proceed speedily to consider the relief of those who had been unfortunately affected and afflicted by the ravages of the great drought which spread devastation throughout a fair portion of the Republic. In accordance with his right the President of the United States suggested an appropriation of \$25,000,000 for that purpose. The Senate saw fit, as did the House, to change the amount. My contention is that both acted within their rights, and that the President, from his viewpoint, was fully justified in the recommendation he made to the American Congress. He had information directly from the lips of John Barton Payne, president of the American Red Cross, just as I have had it from his lips on more than one occasion, that his organization throughout the United States is amply provided with funds to take care of any personal suffering which might result from the ravages of the drought. The first time I conversed with Judge Payne, he had no thought of expending money for the purchasing of seed or fertilizer or other equipment, and yet up to the present time the Red Cross has expended over \$300,000 for those purposes, although it was not a part of their original plan.

Senators, the Red Cross has a representative in the county seats of practically every county in the United States. In each of the small towns in every county in turn it likewise has a representative; and so the Red Cross has facilities for securing information not excelled by any organization under the American flag. I am informed that the Red Cross, through its representatives, reaching into every portion of the Republic, even the most remote places, has scoured the country, and I am assured that it is amply able to care for all the personal suffering that may grow out of the prevalence of drought conditions; that is to say, any freezing on the part of individuals or starving or lack of clothing or lack of fuel. Therefore, in view of those facts, the President was amply justified in making his recommendation to Congress.

According to the system under which the Red Cross gathers its funds, if, for instance, a contribution of \$5 is collected, 50 cents of it goes to the general headquarters and \$4.50 remains in the local headquarters. Those local headquarters, according to the report given me by Judge Payne and members of the board of directors, are now provided with funds sufficient to meet every emergency that may confront them, in so far as they have gathered the facts, and they tell me that they have gathered them completely.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WATSON. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I am very much interested in what the Senator is saying about the activities of the Red Cross. In my own State of Massachusetts within the last year every one of its 100 municipalities with a population of over 5,000 has had to increase very substantially its appropriations to relieve the demands of the destitute.

Mr. WATSON. Has that been on account of the drought?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. No.

Mr. WATSON. I am now talking about the drought.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I thought the Senator from Indiana was talking about the general condition.

Mr. WATSON. No; I am talking only about the drought. I will come to the other aspect of the situation in a moment.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The Senator from Indiana will pardon me.

Mr. WATSON. Certainly.

I am speaking now particularly of the drought conditions, relief for which was first on the recommended program. I submit that the program itself remains untouched and unimpaired, and that we are proceeding with the plan as originally outlined to provide relief for those afflicted by the drought.

I was talking only this morning with Judge Payne over the telephone, and he gave me an illustration, using the town and the county in which he lives in Virginia. It was one of the hardest hit in the entire drought area; my recollection is that Secretary Hyde, after having made a survey, said it was literally "burned up," and that the ravages there were more complete than almost anywhere else. The chairman of the Red Cross of that county had communicated with Judge Payne, stating that if he would permit the county to retain the 50 cents which otherwise would be sent to headquarters, he would care for every need of those suffering from the effects of the drought in that area. He said, "I am prepared to make this statement, after a full investigation, using all the facilities at my command, that we can care for drought sufferers with the funds in our hands."

Therefore, knowing those facts, the President felt amply justified in making a recommendation for a \$25,000,000 appropriation for that specific purpose.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question for information?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. WATSON. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. When and to whom did the President recommend that the appropriation for the purposes to which the Senator is now referring should be limited to \$25,000,000?

Mr. WATSON. I do not know that the President did so, but I am saying that the President recommended, as I understood, an appropriation of \$25,000,000.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. If the Senator will permit me, I will suggest that the recommendation in the President's message is in this language:

In order that the Government may meet its full obligation toward our countrymen in distress through no fault of their own, I recommend that an appropriation should be made to the Department of Agriculture to be loaned for the purpose of seed and feed for animals. Its application should as hitherto in such loans be limited to a gross amount to any one individual, and secured upon the crop.

Mr. WATSON. That is quite correct.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Will the Senator permit me to proceed?

Mr. WATSON. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. In so far as my information goes, what I have read from his message is the only committal of the President upon the subject. The Budget Bureau, however, did make a recommendation that the amount to be appropriated for the purposes set forth in the paragraph of the President's message, which I have just read, should be limited to \$25,000,000.

Mr. WATSON. That is correct.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. But, so far as the President is concerned, the only recommendation he has made to Congress of which I have any knowledge is the one I have just read.

Mr. WATSON. Which is quite true, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. And in the hearings before the Committee on Agriculture, and in the discussion of the subject before the Senate, the challenge was made of the assertion that \$25,000,000 recommended by the Budget Bureau would be adequate to meet the purposes described

in the President's message, which the Senator from Indiana is now discussing.

Mr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. And it was further stated that the very agencies set up by the President to make a scientific investigation and ascertain the approximate amount required for that purpose had recommended an appropriation of \$60,000,000. I thank the Senator from Indiana for yielding to me.

Mr. WATSON. I am very glad to have had the contribution by the Senator, and I fully concur in what he has said. Nevertheless, the President accepted the estimate of the Budget Bureau of \$25,000,000 as the limit of the appropriation, according to the suggestion that I am seeking to make. When the estimate came here it went before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, presided over by our ever faithful friend, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], in whose intelligence and loyalty we have supreme confidence, and, after a review of the whole situation, the committee increased the appropriation.

I assume, acting within their authority and as the agent of the Senate of the United States, that they had a perfect right to increase it. I do not assume that anybody has the right to abuse the President of the United States because he or the Budget Bureau limited the recommendation to \$25,000,000; and yet, unfortunately, language has been indulged in here toward the President almost as if he were a culprit because he limited the appropriation to that amount, but the committee of the Senate of the United States saw fit to increase that appropriation. That is one of the questions now before us.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. I dislike very much to obtrude this observation, but it is not fair to say that the Senate committee increased the appropriation to \$60,000,000. The joint resolution which I introduced was sent to me by the Department of Agriculture two weeks before action was taken. It called for \$60,000,000, and I had reason to believe that the President knew what his right hand was doing.

Mr. WATSON. I am very glad to have the Senator make that statement.

Mr. McNARY. Just a moment. Two days before this matter came up the Director of the Budget, without a word of explanation, without an argument, sent us a bill proposing to appropriate \$25,000,000, which I assumed to be the later action and attitude of the President. The committee considered both proposals, frowned on the \$25,000,000 suggestion, and adhered to the original proposal made by the Secretary of Agriculture, and, without a dissenting vote, reported the measure in that way.

Mr. WATSON. And the Senate acceded to the recommendation of the committee and adopted its report. I am saying now that what the President had in mind, as I gather, was that the estimate made by the Budget was sufficient, particularly in view of the report made to him by the Red Cross authorities.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. WATSON. Certainly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Just as a matter of information, may I inquire of the chairman of the committee or of the Senator from Arkansas, whichever one may have the information, whether or not the sum of \$60,000,000 was arrived at at the conference held by representatives from the various drought-stricken States which met here under the auspices of the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. If I may be permitted to answer, I will say that I understand that to be a fact, and so stated in my address to the Senate a few days ago. The President caused to be created committees in the various States particularly interested in the legislation, and those

committees made a somewhat careful survey of the conditions existing in the various counties. Their representatives met here in Washington, collaborated, and reached the conclusion that approximately \$60,000,000 was the amount required for the purposes of the joint resolution which we passed.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I thank the Senator for the information.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, the other portion of the recommendation was that a sum of from \$100,000,000 to \$150,000,000 should be appropriated for the purposes of embarking upon governmental improvements and construction work. It is charged that that is not a sufficient and adequate sum to care for the general unemployment throughout the country. So again the question arises as to how far local organizations and private charity can take care of the situation and adequately cope with it.

Some time ago the President appointed a committee, headed by Col. Arthur Woods, for the purpose of ascertaining the exact situation. By telephone and otherwise Colonel Woods has been in touch with the governors of 44 States and with representatives of the other 4 States and with the mayors of over 200 cities in the United States.

The governors and the mayors have collaborated in the appointment of committees in the various localities for the purpose, first, of ascertaining the extent of unemployment, and, second, of the amount of money that would be required to prevent suffering because of unemployment. The local committees in the various cities, as I am told, have taken really a census of the whole situation, so that if there be any way that organization can correctly ascertain the facts, the general committee, using all its facilities, has done so and has come to the conclusion that with two or three exceptions—and I am not sure but that New York City is one of them—the local authorities and the local charitable organization and the local committees organized for the purpose are in a position to take care of the local situation, and that at this time no appropriation is required from the Treasury of the United States to meet this particular phase of the emergency.

Senators, the organization under Colonel Woods, as I am told, is a very effective one. It has called to its support every charitable organization in every one of the various localities and cities in the country, and I am very happy in the belief that never before in the history of this or any other land have competent and able individuals sprung to the relief of the unfortunate as they have done in the exigent condition surrounding and just ahead of us. They have contributed most liberally of their private funds to every charitable movement, so that the Government is in position to state that funds are not lacking with which to meet the conditions that have so deeply impressed themselves upon the heart and mind of every Senator.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Senator has referred to the report on unemployment by Mr. Woods, and he has stated, as I understand, that that report shows the necessity for \$150,000,000.

Mr. WATSON. Oh, no; not at all; but something supplemental.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Supplemental to that amount?

Mr. WATSON. Yes. I will come to that in a little while.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. What I wish to ask the Senator about is the report of Mr. Woods. Is that report available for the study of the Senate?

Mr. WATSON. I will say to the Senator that I talked to him personally.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. But I understand that the Senate adopted a resolution asking that that report be sent down.

Mr. WATSON. As to that, I do not know. I wondered why Colonel Woods had not appeared before any committee. I called the chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], and told him that I thought Colonel Woods ought to be subpoenaed or asked to come before the committee for the purpose of disclosing the situation as he had stated it to me privately. I also suggested to Representative Wood, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House, that Colonel Woods should be called for the purpose of making a report on that situation, because I regarded it as vital in connection with the situation we are considering at this time.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. May I say to the Senator that my information is that the resolution of the Senate calling for the report of Mr. Woods has not yet been responded to. The report has not been sent down.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. WATSON. Certainly.

Mr. CARAWAY. Of course, I am not familiar with the information that has been given to the Senator from Indiana with reference to the relief of a situation that is appalling; but I have from the Red Cross, as of the date of November 15—and the list has been very much enlarged since that time—the information that in my own State there are 85,687 farm families that have no means of livelihood.

In Kentucky there are 32,500.

In Louisiana there are 13,000.

In Mississippi there are 44,000.

In Missouri there are 5,000.

In Oklahoma there are 14,000.

In Texas there are 12,000.

In Alabama there are 1,750.

In Indiana, the Senator's own State, there are 4,100.

In Illinois there are 1,300 families.

Mr. WATSON. What are the figures the Senator is reading—4,100 what?

Mr. CARAWAY. Four thousand one hundred families.

Mr. WATSON. Four thousand one hundred families on farms?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes, sir; in Indiana.

Mr. WATSON. But on farms?

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. WATSON. The Senator has gone back now to talk about the effects of the drought?

Mr. CARAWAY. I thought the Senator was talking about the situation that confronted people who had nothing to do, no employment, and no means of living. If that was not in the Senator's speech, I do not want to interrupt him.

Mr. WATSON. That is all right; but I was distinguishing between the effects of the drought and the general unemployment in the cities, because the Red Cross is not dealing with the general unemployment in the cities; only with the drought situation.

Mr. CARAWAY. It is not dealing with that.

Mr. WATSON. I only know what they tell me.

Mr. CARAWAY. That is what I started to call attention to. There are 209,400 families, which comprise more than a million people, in the agricultural districts of 15 States, and there are 7 others that are affected; and I have a letter from a most reputable lawyer, a man acquainted with the situation, saying that the Red Cross is doing nothing to alleviate that situation.

I have here a letter which has just reached me in which this situation is discussed; and this statement is made in regard to one town down in Arkansas, in the county in which my colleague [Mr. ROBINSON] was raised:

I understand from the superintendent of our public schools that in at least 200 families the school children are on a slow-starvation diet now.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, the great Red Cross organization has its antennae reaching out into every section of the country. It is an organization that up to this time always has been able to take care of situations of this kind. With all its facilities for obtaining knowledge and informa-

tion, I assume that when the chairman of the Red Cross makes a statement of the kind he has made he is speaking by the card. Of course, if he is wrong I have no way of ascertaining the facts; but I will say to my friend from Arkansas that the chairman of the Red Cross states that the local representatives of the organization are so fully taking care of the situation presented at this time that but very few demands for funds have come to the general head of the Red Cross here.

Mr. CARAWAY. I do not know what demands have been made, or what statements the chairman of the Red Cross makes; but I got these figures from the Red Cross itself one day last week.

Mr. WATSON. What do they say?

Mr. CARAWAY. That in 15 States 209,000 farm families were destitute.

Mr. WATSON. And are not being cared for at all by the Red Cross?

Mr. CARAWAY. Oh, the statement did not say that; but, if the Senator will pardon me just one moment—

Mr. WATSON. Certainly.

Mr. CARAWAY. Every mail brings letters, sometimes more than 200 a day—some from business men, some from county officials, some from professional men, and some from some old farmer whose hand has been cramped by toil until when he takes up his pencil he can hardly write a legible letter, and every one of them contains exactly the same statement—that they are destitute, that suffering is everywhere rampant, and no relief is in sight. I can not conceive that everybody is untruthful.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, I have not any doubt of the authenticity or correctness of the Senator's figures. Of course, we understand that the drought played havoc in many States, including the Senator's and my own; but notwithstanding the gravity of the situation it is my understanding that the Red Cross is provided with funds to take care of it. That is the statement made to me.

Mr. CARAWAY. That is exactly what I was trying to undeceive the Senator about. It is not; and let me ask the Senator one question: Does the Senator believe that where a situation is as critical as this situation is, and where destitution and distress and want are so widespread, those people ought to be relegated to charitable institutions for relief?

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, if charity is amply able to take care of them, and all the service organizations and all the charitable organizations and the Red Cross are prepared to meet the situation, I know of no reason why we should go outside to get relief.

Mr. CARAWAY. In other words, the Senator insists that a third of the people ought to become mendicants, and go around and ask charity, although they created every dollar of wealth that there is in the country?

Mr. WATSON. But, my dear friend, they would be no more mendicants under such conditions than if we handed them doles out of the public Treasury.

Mr. CARAWAY. Oh, "doles"! What does the Senator mean by "doles"? These people created the wealth. The Government itself never created a dollar. For every dollar's worth of wealth there is in these United States somebody's back ached, and somebody's brow sweated. The Government does not make money.

Mr. WATSON. I understand all that; but the Senator knows the difference between money handed out of the Treasury of the United States and private charity which is handed out by the Red Cross, or a Rotary Club, or a Kiwanis Club, or any of the churches, or the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, or any other organization of like character.

Mr. CARAWAY. Of course I know the difference. I know that these people created the wealth that is in the Treasury, and in times like this they ought to be permitted to live on it.

Mr. WATSON. Who created the wealth?

Mr. CARAWAY. The people who now are asking for it. The lawyers never created it.

Mr. WATSON. No.

Mr. CARAWAY. The banks never created it. Somebody's back ached for it, and somebody's brow sweated for it. They are the men who created the wealth.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, I can state to the Senator my position on that subject. If I profoundly believed and could be convinced that there is destitution in the United States, that there is suffering, that the people are dying from starvation or from cold, and that the local authorities all told, with their combined efforts, can not render aid and prevent death, then I would take money from the Treasury of the United States. But until I am convinced of that situation—and I am not convinced—I am not willing to go beyond the local organizations.

Mr. CARAWAY. Oh, of course; the Senator will vote for an appropriation to hang wreaths on their tombs, and that is as soon as he will act.

Mr. WATSON. According to the Senator, they would not even have tombs.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATSON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator from Indiana used the word "dole." Does he regard the appropriation to relieve the drought-stricken area as a dole?

Mr. WATSON. Oh, no; I do not.

Mr. GEORGE. To what particular appropriation does the Senator refer when he uses the word?

Mr. WATSON. I am not referring to any appropriation. I am talking about a dole system as we understand it as practiced in England and in Germany. The Senator knows what that is.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is not addressing himself to the situation in the United States?

Mr. WATSON. Yes; I am saying that I am opposed to a general dole system in the United States.

Mr. GEORGE. We have made no appropriation except of funds to relieve the drought.

Mr. WATSON. We have not; and I do not regard that now as a dole.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator used the word, and I did not think he wanted to go to the country in that light, because that is a loan; and past experiences of the Government have demonstrated that it is a loan that has been repaid in practically every instance.

Mr. WATSON. I understand that thoroughly.

Mr. GEORGE. There is not any element of dole in it.

Mr. WATSON. The Senator is right. I am going to address myself now to that phase of the matter for a moment.

My honored friend the chairman of the Agricultural Committee, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], came to me with the bill and showed me that the appropriation is amply safeguarded under its own provisions; that at most it is but a loan; and that even then the Secretary of Agriculture is not compelled to make it unless, in his judgment, an emergency exists. I am assuming, of course, that all of us would be opposed to the dole system—I mean a continuous appropriation, year after year, of funds out of the Treasury to take care of such conditions as now exist. I am not going to discuss that question, because it is not before us; but it is my contention, based upon the information we now have from both the Red Cross and the other committee appointed for the purpose of meeting the situation, that we can largely take care of it at the present time without great appropriations from the Treasury of the United States and with no more than we have appropriated to give employment to those who are unemployed along the lines that we now contemplate by pending measures.

Mr. President, I wish also to say that I am assuming that Herbert Hoover is as familiar with the various aspects of unemployment and with measures to take care of the unemployed as any man anywhere.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, does the Senator refer to the statement which the President issued on the 8th of last March, that within 60 days unemployment would be

so substantially reduced that it would no longer be a serious problem?

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, the statement made by the President at that time he thought was justified by the facts, or else he would not have made it. I stood here, on this very spot, and uttered a prediction that within a very short time we would be on the upgrade, that the clouds would be dissipated and that the skies would be clear. I was mistaken. I was mistaken because I did not at that time know the depth and the intensity of the world-wide depression that grasped the world in its relentless clutch. I did not know that. Nobody knew it at that time. At that time I felt that because prosperity had come after the passage of every real protective tariff bill, it would be so in this instance, and, my friends, it did not come because of extraneous conditions over which neither we nor any other people had or could gain control.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WATSON. Surely.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. My interruption was prompted by the fact that the Senator was referring to the President of the United States as being aware of the unemployment situation and the suffering caused thereby.

Mr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I merely wanted to point out that when others in this country who were considering the situation considered it to be extremely grave last March, the President of the United States, after considerable investigation, reported it as his judgment that within 60 days unemployment would be so substantially reduced that it would no longer be a serious problem.

Mr. WATSON. Does the Senator mean to intimate that the President did not believe that when he said it?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not intimate any such thing.

Mr. WATSON. Of course not.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. But I cite the fact as an indication that the President of the United States is not the infallible prophet concerning unemployment the Senator from Indiana just suggested he was.

Mr. WATSON. I have not suggested at any time that the President was a prophet. I have said, however, that when a situation of unemployment confronted him, he had done more to help it than any other man alive could have done.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is a broad assertion, Mr. President.

Mr. WATSON. That the agencies under his control and at his command had fed more hungry, clothed more naked, and given warmth to more cold people than any other agency under any other man who to-day walks the earth.

I have been assuming that in a condition of unemployment, if there be a problem—and there is—confronting us of taking care of those suffering and in destitution, this man has as much knowledge of how to afford relief as anybody else, and anyone who either read or heard that noble utterance of the President of the United States in opening the child-welfare conference, recently held here at his suggestion, knows that his heart would not be closed to the wailing cry of distress wherever it might be uttered under our flag.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WATSON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator has referred to the heretofore wide experience of the President in relieving suffering. He did it largely through appropriations from the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. WATSON. Oh, no. The activities of the President and his committee in affording relief in Europe during the war were financed largely outside of the Treasury of the United States, although it is quite true that we appropriated \$25,000,000 to feed starving people in Russia and that we appropriated \$100,000,000 to feed the people of Europe. It is also quite true that the present President of the United States, or organizations under his guidance, had much to do with expending that money, and distributing it where it

really did save misery in all those countries intended to be benefited.

If the present President of the United States, with his sympathies always running strong, as everybody knows they do, for those who are afflicted, and having the idea that he has at hand organizations capable of relieving those in distress, is willing to say that the people over whom he has been called to preside can be amply taken care of in any suffering and misery by such organizations, then I am willing to pin my faith to his statement, because I know that the President of the United States has as much knowledge as any man on such a subject, and I further know that his heart throbs as violently for those people as the heart of any other man under the sun.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, may I ask my friend if he believes that these organizations are taking care of the situation now?

Mr. WATSON. They tell me they are.

Mr. SMITH. What is the Senator's opinion?

Mr. WATSON. My opinion is that they are, because they say they are.

Mr. SMITH. Oh!

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, did I correctly understand the Senator to say that, no matter what the situation might be, he accepted without inquiry and without question everything the President said?

Mr. WATSON. No; again the Senator is getting away from what I said.

Mr. CARAWAY. I am getting back to one sentence the Senator said.

Mr. WATSON. I will say to my friend that, based on the reports of the Red Cross, that magnificent organization reaching everywhere, and based on the reports of the committee which the President appointed for the express purpose of dealing with the situation, he has made his recommendations after personal study, and I stand by them and abide by them.

Mr. CARAWAY. That is what I was trying to say.

Mr. WATSON. That is what I say.

Mr. CARAWAY. The Senator advocates what the President says, anything he might know to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. WATSON. I do not know anything to the contrary.

Mr. CARAWAY. The Senator said he did, but I did not know whether he did or not.

Mr. WATSON. I did not say I did; I said I did not. Now that that fight is over, I will go to the next theme.

Mr. President, this is not the first time we have been called upon to adjourn politics in this body in the presence of a great emergency. Those of us who were here during the war period remember that we adjourned partisan politics at that time, and to a degree sometimes that harassed the souls of some men on this side of the Chamber. We all know we voted billions of dollars of appropriations unquestioningly, because it was necessary in order to do the thing we set out to do. By act after act we clothed the President with power, until he stood possessed of greater authority than anybody in the country had ever dreamed of. We did it because he said he needed it to end the war, and no man was willing to lay a straw in the way of his country while it was in the midst of war, marching on to battle with a mighty foe. That was our position.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WATSON. I yield.

Mr. JONES. I remind the Senator, too, of this fact, that some of the important legislation desired by the administration at that time had to be taken charge of and handled by Republicans, and action was taken without regard to politics.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WATSON. I yield.

Mr. FESS. At the time we entered the war the Republican Members of the House of Representatives met in conference, and after an evening of consideration agreed almost unanimously that whenever the President asked anything on the ground that it was necessary in order to assist

in winning the war it would be supported by the Republicans as a party, leaving any individual, if there were some particular reason why he could not vote for any measure, free to vote as he pleased. It was decided that that should be the attitude of the party in the minority, and the action was taken by the party in a party conference.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Indiana a question?

Mr. WATSON. Certainly; I yield to the Senator to ask a question.

Mr. BORAH. What is the relevancy to the present situation of what the Senator from Ohio has just said?

Mr. WATSON. I am going to bring that out.

Mr. FESS. It is relevant as showing an instance of cooperation on the part of the minority.

Mr. WATSON. I think the relevancy is this, I will say to the able Senator from Idaho, that while, thank God, we are not in war, nevertheless a condition confronts us in the United States second only to a condition of war. The Senator himself made a sententious appeal here this morning for God's sake to go on and pass legislation to relieve this situation. I repeat it, for God's sake let us proceed and relieve the situation. That is why I honor the Senator from Arkansas and that is why I am keeping my faith with several Democrats who asked that we adjourn politics until we could meet the great emergency which now confronts us. That is why I am making the appeal to all the Senators here to forget partisan politics until we have discharged our obligations to the country and to those of our people who may be in distress and who, after all, at this time are the wards of the Republic. I think to that extent the situations are parallel.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. WATSON. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. Of course, we should overlook party politics in a situation like this; but does the Senator mean to say that a Senator should surrender his individual convictions as to what he should do?

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, the Senator knows I do not mean that at all, and that I have not done that in the past and I will not in the future. I am simply talking about the present situation. In other words, the program is this: Not to filibuster appropriation bills, to pass appropriations to meet the drought situation, to pass appropriations to meet the unemployment situation; and I insist that that program is being followed out, and that the plan of cooperation has not broken down, but is going on to a fine consummation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WATSON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. That agreement did not provide that we were to pass only such measures as the President should suggest, did it?

Mr. WATSON. It did not; but, as I stated in the opening of my remarks, as the Senator knows if he did me the honor of listening to me, it is the business of the Chief Executive to recommend. That he has done. It is our business to take the recommendations and deal with them in some way. That we are now doing. To that end I am pleading with the Members of this body to proceed to the consummation of the work we have in hand.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. WATSON. Certainly.

Mr. CARAWAY. Did I understand the Senator to say that this cooperation was going forward?

Mr. WATSON. That is my understanding.

Mr. CARAWAY. Then why is the Senate being lectured by the Senator from Indiana if it is going forward?

Mr. WATSON. I am not lecturing; I am exhorting.

Mr. CARAWAY. Exhorting?

Mr. WATSON. Yes; I am exhorting the Senator. The Senator goes to church often enough to know the difference between a sermon and an exhortation.

Mr. CARAWAY. I do. Evidently the Senator does not, because I did not recognize what he was saying as an exhortation at all.

Mr. WATSON. I refer the Senator to "Bishop" Sims. [Laughter.]

Mr. CARAWAY. May I ask the Senator what was the occasion for him exhorting the Senate, then, if cooperation was going forward? Who is filibustering?

Mr. WATSON. Nobody.

Mr. CARAWAY. What is the Senator doing?

Mr. WATSON. The Senator is listening to me. There is no use haggling with me about a question of this kind, because the Senator knows I was not born yesterday, and I know what I am doing.

Mr. CARAWAY. That is what I am trying to find out.

Mr. WATSON. Here is the point: That there have been statements in the newspapers, as the Senator knows, over and over again, about the failure of the plan of cooperation.

Mr. CARAWAY. The Senator is just lecturing the press, then?

Mr. WATSON. No; I am lecturing the Senator, because I want to be sure that the Senator stands where I think his good heart and good judgment lead him to stand; not against any of these things, except as legitimate debate would lead him to be.

Mr. CARAWAY. This is all legitimate debate the Senator is engaged in I presume?

Mr. WATSON. I hope it is.

Mr. CARAWAY. What is it about?

Mr. WATSON. It is about cooperation.

Mr. CARAWAY. Who was threatening cooperation?

Mr. WATSON. All over this Chamber, in private conversation—

Mr. CARAWAY. Name somebody.

Mr. WATSON. I will not name anybody. The Senator knows I will not do that.

Mr. CARAWAY. I do. I know the Senator can not.

Mr. WATSON. The Senator knows better than that. Not only that, but the Senator knows that on the other side of the Chamber there was more or less of an outbreak against the declaration of the seven eminent Democrats who signed it.

Mr. CARAWAY. Who made the outbreak?

Mr. WATSON. The Senator was here, I assume.

Mr. CARAWAY. But he did not hear it.

Mr. WATSON. And the newspapers were filled with it. The Senator knows that. What I am trying to get through the hearts of my friends—I will not say through their heads—is that the cooperation is going on apace and that we intend to keep it up until we consummate the projects.

Mr. CARAWAY. I am sure the Senator's speech is intended and calculated to create harmony.

Mr. WATSON. I hope it is.

Mr. CARAWAY. I rather suspect the Senator does really think so.

Mr. WATSON. Are not my friend and I closer together than we were when I started?

Mr. CARAWAY. No; I was going down the center aisle when the Senator started. [Laughter.]

Mr. WATSON. Of course Senators realize that this is all in good part, and designed, of course, to promote harmony and good feeling. This ought to be an era of good feeling among us.

We all know what the conditions in the country are; I am not going to waste words in attempting to describe them. We all know the situation which faces us, and which we faced when we met here. We all know what the recommendations of the President of the United States were. We all know what our committees have done to carry out those recommendations in earnest good faith. We all know that even yet there are some mutterings about whether or not the cooperation shall continue, or whether or not it shall break down.

What I am trying to do, so far as I can, is, first, to show the absolute good faith of the President of the United States in making his recommendations and the bases he has for

those recommendations; and, second, to show the absolute good faith of our own colleagues here and our own committees in taking the action they have taken with reference to those recommendations.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. WATSON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. If that were all of it, that would be all right, but after the President had exercised his function in advising the Senate as to the situation as he saw it, and after the Senate had exercised its function passing a joint resolution, in which it fixed the amount of the appropriation as it saw fit, with all the information before it, the President went to the newspapers and gave out a statement saying that the Senate was engaged—that every Member of the Senate was engaged, because every one of us voted for the joint resolution—in making a raid upon the Treasury and “playing politics at the expense of human misery.” I think if there is to be cooperation, that it should not all be required of one side, but that there should be cooperation all along, by the President as well as by the Congress.

Mr. WATSON. I am entirely willing to have the Senator have his views on that question.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does not the Senator have that view?

Mr. WATSON. I am not going to quarrel with the Senator's view on that question.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does not the Senator hold that view?

Mr. WATSON. I am not going to quarrel with the Senator's view on that question, because I deprecate and deplore crimination and recrimination anywhere at this time. I believe the way to cooperate is to cooperate, and the way to harmonize is to bring to an end the bandying of epithets and by the getting together of those who believe in a common purpose and are animated by a common patriotism.

Mr. President, I had not intended to occupy the floor so long, but I have been very deeply impressed, first, by the necessitous character of the situation with which we are dealing, its grave aspects and imports; and, secondly, by the thought that the representatives of the various States of the Union in this great body should band together at this particular time, with partisan politics adjourned until we shall have consummated the object we have in view. At all events, if we shall discharge our obligations, as I have no doubt we will, we shall meet with the universal acclaim of the people who are satisfied with our work, and each one of us will be inspired in his own heart with the reflection that he has done his duty to his country.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Indiana two questions?

Mr. WATSON. Certainly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. As the result of his conversation with Colonel Woods does the Senator think Colonel Woods takes the position that there is no suffering in the United States at this time due to unemployment?

Mr. WATSON. No; he does not.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. What position does he take with regard to that situation?

Mr. WATSON. He takes the position that while there is suffering, it is being met and cared for by the various local authorities in the various communities of the country.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Does he declare that the relief is adequate?

Mr. WATSON. He declares that it is adequate in the sense that it is caring for the situation and has the funds to care for it just as rapidly as the conditions are ascertained.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Then I take it that Colonel Woods has informed the Senator that there is not serious suffering on the part of the unemployed and their dependents in the United States to-day?

Mr. WATSON. I would not put it in just that way.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. How would the Senator put it?

Mr. WATSON. That, while, of course, there is suffering, a census is now being taken in the cities, even extending into homes for the purpose of ascertaining it, and that something in the nature of a very effective organization is being perfected for that purpose, and just as fast as they find it

they are relieving it and are amply provided with funds to relieve it locally. That is my answer.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Indiana to say that Colonel Woods takes the position that the program for the expansion of public works contained in the message of the President of the United States and the recommendations of the Budget are adequate to relieve unemployment in the coming year?

Mr. WATSON. We had no conversation about that at all.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Does the Senator know whether it be true or not that Colonel Woods regards the program to which the Senator has referred as the President's program for the expansion of public works as adequate in the present emergency?

Mr. WATSON. I do not know whether he does or not. We did not discuss that at all.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I am in possession of certain information concerning conditions in several cities in the United States concerning the unemployed and their dependents which challenges the optimistic statements of the Senator from Indiana. This information comes in answer to a telegram sent on December 8 by President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, to the secretaries of the central labor bodies in various cities of the United States. These telegrams demonstrate that the time has come when the Senate of the United States and the Congress should ascertain the facts about the situation.

The policy of the administration since the stock-market crash in 1929 has been to minimize the economic results of the depression and to play down the number of unemployed. The time has come to stop trying to talk the people of the United States out of this situation. The time has come for the Senate and the Congress to ascertain what are the facts concerning the situation and to act accordingly.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. WATSON. Suppose the Senator were at the head of a committee to ascertain the facts, would not the very first thing that he would do be to send for John Barton Payne, head of the Red Cross?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I understood the Senator to say that when he talked with Judge Payne he did not find out anything about conditions except as to the drought situation.

Mr. WATSON. That is all. Then when he got to the general unemployment situation would he not very naturally send for Colonel Woods, head of the committee appointed for that purpose and who has been for three months investigating it?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I suggested on the floor of the Senate early last week that it struck me as extraordinary that the Appropriations Committee should report out the administration's public works expansion program, and that it should pass the Senate without the committee's having ascertained either directly or indirectly all the information which Colonel Woods could give and obtaining his recommendations concerning it. Instead the Senator from Indiana comes here now after this bill has passed the Senate and gives us a secondhand summary of a telephone conversation with Colonel Woods. The Senate of the United States has gone on record as asking Colonel Woods for his report in order that it might have the benefit of it. Although that report, according to the press, was submitted to the President many weeks ago, it has not been forthcoming and is not even now, at this late hour, available for the consideration of the Senate.

Before reading these letters and telegrams I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the conservative character of the statements which are made. I submit that any Senator who studies them will be impressed with the fact that they are written with the purpose of giving the most reliable information possible.

First, is a letter from the secretary of the Pittsburgh Central Labor Union, of Pittsburgh, Pa., dated December

10, 1930, addressed to Mr. William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, and reading as follows:

PITTSBURGH CENTRAL LABOR UNION,
Pittsburgh, Pa., December 10, 1930.

MR. WILLIAM GREEN,
American Federation of Labor Headquarters,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER: In answer to your telegram regarding the number of unemployed in Pittsburgh, Pa., I desire to state that the nearest figures I can gather is that there are about twenty thousand or thereabouts.

As to the conditions of these people I find that there is a great deal of suffering through the fact of lack of food, clothing, shoes, and shelter.

While there is, and has been a great deal of good work done on the part of the city officials, welfare associations, and a number of individuals, yet from all accounts their finances are getting somewhat low and the outlook for the remainder of the winter is very bad.

Trusting this will answer your request, I remain,
Fraternally,

P. J. McGRATH.

Here is one from the Detroit Federation of Labor, dated December 10, 1930, also addressed to President Green:

DECEMBER 10, 1930.

MR. WILLIAM GREEN,
President American Federation of Labor,
A. F. of L. Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER: Replying to your telegram, we desire to inform you that the survey made by the mayor's unemployment committee two months ago reveals that there were 210,000 unemployed people in the city of Detroit. Since that time there has been constant registration of additional people, averaging about 500 a day.

Reports have it that the Ford Motor Co. has laid off seven or eight thousand since this survey was made and many of the other industries have done likewise.

The Detroit Public Welfare Commission reports that there are some 32,000 families on the welfare list. There is much suffering, due to hunger, lack of clothing, and lack of proper shelter in our city. This is in spite of efforts that have been made by many splendid organizations and the mayor's unemployment committee to give relief.

At the present time the Detroit Federation of Labor is operating a free dining room, where we are feeding between three and four hundred people a day. This is only one of about a dozen dining rooms being operated in Detroit, most of whom are feeding many times more than we are.

There doesn't appear to be any immediate relief in sight for the situation existing here.

Fraternally yours,
FRANK X. MARTEL,
President Detroit Federation of Labor.

The next one is from the city of Reading, Pa., signed by the secretary of the Federated Trades Council, also addressed to Mr. Green:

READING, PA., December 10, 1930.

MR. WILLIAM GREEN,
American Federation of Labor, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER: In reply to your telegram.

Census taken November 24 to 26, 3,100 residents of Reading, adults registered out of work, with approximately 6,200 dependents. Chamber of commerce report as of December 1, 6,000 less employed in Reading industries December 1, 1930, than December 1, 1929—this covers persons working in city and living in suburbs.

Mayor of city called conference on unemployment December 2. City council, county commissioners, school board, manufacturers' association, chamber of commerce, welfare federation, and federated trades council were represented.

A permanent organization was set up, with three standing committees—job finding, relief, and finance.

City council, school board, and county commissioners were asked to start public work; all have agreed to cooperate to full extent of their power.

Reading Eagle asked for subscriptions to a fund of \$100,000. The city council granted use of old city hall 4-story building as a center for all activities. Food, clothing, coal, and supplies will be distributed from that center.

Widespread suffering and distress due entirely to unemployment exists to a far greater extent than we anticipated.

Community chest funds for relief and health exhausted in six months of fiscal year due to unusual demands.

In my opinion, State and Federal assistance will be needed during the coming winter.

Fraternally yours,
M. L. WOLFSKILL,
Secretary Federated Trades Council.

MR. WATSON. Mr. President, from what city does that telegram come?

MR. LA FOLLETTE. From Reading, Pa.

MR. WATSON. I think the Senator is doing a service in calling attention to matters of that kind. I am wondering whether or not these people have ever communicated with

the investigating committee appointed by the President, or with Colonel Woods, or representatives of his committee? I will say, if the Senator will yield a moment further—

MR. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly.

MR. WATSON. They have six men from the Department of Commerce, who have their salaries paid for that purpose, who travel all over the United States all the time constantly hunting up things of this kind. I would be very glad indeed if these matters could be referred to that committee.

MR. LA FOLLETTE. How long does the Senator from Indiana think it would take six men, even from the Department of Commerce, to make a survey in all of the cities in the United States to ascertain whether people are hungry and suffering from lack of clothing, shelter, or fuel?

MR. WATSON. The Senator has asked a question, and I will answer it. Six men could not do it at all, but six men going to places like those to which the Senator is calling attention could accomplish much good. The local authorities everywhere are in touch with the heads here. The six men are "scouts" sent out to investigate the very situation the Senator is setting forth in these letters and telegrams.

MR. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the point I want to make is that we have a statement made by the Republican leader on the floor of the Senate that the situation is well in hand, that there is not any occasion for even the consideration of Federal relief in this situation. He makes that statement upon assurances given to him, as I understand, by Colonel Woods, head of the President's Unemployment Commission, which presumably, if it has not been derelict in its duty, has been investigating this situation for months. The Senator rises here and says that, according to the chairman of that commission, the situation is well in hand and we do not need to worry about it. I could not let that assertion go unchallenged in the RECORD, being in possession of information. I am submitting it, Mr. President, because I believe that it is the duty of Congress to ascertain what the actual facts are, and to stop taking heresay statements, to assume our own responsibility, and discharge our obligations to the innocent victims of the present economic disaster.

MR. President, if this had been an earthquake there would be no question about the Federal Government promptly and generously discharging its responsibility, but because these millions of unemployed and their dependents are the victims of an economic earthquake, caused by bankruptcy in leadership of American industry, finance, and Government, an attempt is made to discredit any appropriation for their relief by the Federal Government by calling it a dole.

MR. President, no one raised that cry when Herbert Hoover asked for \$100,000,000 to relieve and feed the stricken in Europe; no one called it a dole when we appropriated \$25,000,000 out of the Treasury of the United States to assist the starving in Russia.

MR. WATSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

MR. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

MR. WATSON. The Senator knows very well that I disclaimed the charge that that act was a dole.

MR. LA FOLLETTE. No; I say such a charge was not made at that time; but the Senator has just stated that any suggestion that there should be an appropriation from the Treasury of the United States to assist those who are hungry and starving in the United States in 1930 is a dole.

MR. WATSON. No.

MR. LA FOLLETTE. And he asked, and the RECORD will show that he asked, the Senator from Arkansas if he could not distinguish between relief given by charitable or municipal organizations and money taken out of the Treasury of the United States to support and assist the suffering and the hungry.

MR. WATSON. Certainly, I asked that. I referred not to a single appropriation to meet a single emergent condition but a continuation of appropriations from the Treasury; and I distinctly stated to the Senator that if I were convinced—and, of course, I can be convinced of the fact, the

same as can anybody else—that there is suffering in the country that is not being amply met by private organizations, I would be willing to vote money out of the Treasury for that purpose. I made that statement.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I am submitting this information in the hope that it will enlighten the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. CARAWAY. Of course, I hope the RECORD will be left to reflect just exactly what the Senator from Indiana did say about a dole. I hope it will not be changed.

Mr. WATSON. I am not going to touch the RECORD at all.

Mr. CARAWAY. I hope the Senator will not do so.

Mr. WATSON. And I hope the Senator will read it.

Mr. CARAWAY. I shall read it, although I shall waste my time when I do it.

Mr. WATSON. The Senator will be better informed than he now is if he shall read it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Now, Mr. President, I desire to read other telegrams, some of them showing that conditions are not as the Senator from Indiana has said, well in hand; here is one from East St. Louis, Ill., dated December 10, addressed to President Green:

EAST ST. LOUIS, ILL., December 10, 1930.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President American Federation of Labor:

Approximately 8,000 unemployed in this city. Community fund here not adequate. Conditions very bad. Need of food most essential.

HUNTER B. KEITH,
Secretary Central Trades and Labor Union.

I read other telegrams, as follows:

ASHEVILLE, N. C., December 10, 1930.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President American Federation of Labor,
Washington, D. C.:

Approximately 4,000 Asheville and vicinity. Only temporary relief in sight. Isolated cases of distress. Food and clothing most needed.

CLYDE CARSCADDEN,
Secretary Central Labor Union.

DES MOINES, IOWA, December 11, 1930.

WILLIAM GREEN,
American Federation of Labor, Washington, D. C.:

Five thousand unemployed here now. Relief sufficient at present, but doubtful whether funds will last through the year. Not much suffering yet; conditions slightly below normal.

GILBERT SMITH.

GREENVILLE, S. C., December 10, 1930.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President American Federation of Labor,
Washington, D. C.:

Approximately 10,000 unemployed. Much suffering among women and children for clothes, fuel, food, etc. Very little relief from organized charities. If immediate relief is not given very soon, conditions will be critical.

C. H. GREENE,
Recording Secretary Trades and Labor Council.

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BLEASE. What is that gentleman the recording secretary of?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. He is recording secretary of the Trades and Labor Council of Greenville, S. C.

Mr. BLEASE. What he states is not true.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I submit it for the RECORD, Mr. President.

Here is a telegram from Newark, N. J., which is also addressed to President Green:

NEWARK, N. J., December 10, 1930.

WILLIAM GREEN,
American Federation of Labor Building:

Nineteen thirty population of Newark, 439,728, Newark Evening News. Estimated number of workers by Department of Labor 40 per cent or 175,791. Estimated number of unemployed Department of Labor 17 per cent or 29,884. City of Newark reports 4,600 on poor list. Suffering terrible, conditions deplorable. City placing men to work at \$4 per day pick and shovel. Over 7,000

have applied for work and of this number only 400 were given employment. City issued permits to unemployed to sell apples that proved a miserable failure. Charitable institutions overtaxed and can't hope to give the relief necessary.

HARRY WENDRICH.

Again, from Buffalo, N. Y.:

BUFFALO, N. Y., December 10, 1930.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President American Federation of Labor,
Washington, D. C.:

There are approximately 40,000 unemployed in Buffalo and half as many working part time. Relief is being supplied by the usual city, county, and charity organizations; several groups, including a committee of the chamber of commerce and special women's committees are preparing to assist. All the fraternal organizations are making extra efforts for holiday relief. The acute stage has not been reached as yet, due largely to favorable weather conditions. We anticipate that the relief agencies will be inadequate, the central labor council has urged through their unemployment committee that mortgage holders do not foreclose, that water, gas, and electric service not be discontinued because of inability to pay bills while unemployment exists. Will write you full details of program adopted by the labor movement here.

JOHN C. JOHNSTON,
Secretary Central Labor Council.

CHICAGO, ILL., December 11, 1930.

Mr. WILLIAM GREEN,
American Federation of Labor Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Telegram received. The governor's commission estimated 250,000 unemployed, in which there are 50,000 families in dire need. This represents the registration carried on through the commission. There are thousands who declined to register whose families are in distress, and we have no way of getting the facts. An effort is being made to raise \$5,000,000, which is coming in slowly, and is being used to sustain the accredited relief agencies and furnish employment wherever possible. Relief agencies report demands upon them to sustain families are four times greater than last year, and this is bound to increase after the holidays. There is widespread distress and suffering among men, women, and children, and such relief as is being attempted is only along the sharpest possible lines and represents only a mere existence. Hunger, lack of clothing, fuel, shelter, and protection are the immediate objects which the governor's commission is dealing with. Absolute hunger is being met with a bowl of soup and some bread. A public appeal for old clothes is furnishing much needed clothing. Temporary shelter and protection is being carried on without any regard to standards or requirements of human beings, but with such a tremendous situation to deal with it is all that can be attempted with resources available. All of these things will multiply by leaps and bounds as the winter settles down upon us.

JOHN FITZPATRICK.

Mr. WATSON. Where is that telegram from?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is from Chicago, Ill.

I read others from cities widely scattered over the country.

MOBILE, ALA., December 10, 1930.

WILLIAM GREEN, President,
American Federation of Labor Building,
Washington, D. C.

Fully 15,000 unemployed in Mobile and in need of food and clothing. Community chest limited to rendering aid to most urgent cases. Conditions growing worse as weather grows colder, forcing unemployed workers South. City has opened free lodging house. No provision made to feed hungry central trades council people.

M. E. McDOWELL, Secretary.

ST. LOUIS, MO., December 10, 1930.

WILLIAM GREEN,
American Federation of Labor Building:

At least 50,000 workers idle in St. Louis, Mo., with no chance to secure employment. A number of relief agencies are providing some relief, but not sufficient to prevent extensive suffering amongst thousands of families suffering for the want of food, clothing, fuel, shelter, and other necessities of life.

DAVID KREYLING,
Secretary Central Trades and Labor Union.

NEW YORK, N. Y., December 10, 1930.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President American Federation of Labor,
Washington, D. C.:

Telegram received. Conservative number unemployed 800,000, all workers. Central trades labor council have unemployment committee; president and secretary represented on city committees. Mayor's committee levied 1 per cent assessment on city employees toward a fund. Board of estimate made appropriation toward unemployment fund. City provided Thanksgiving dinners for fifteen hundred families. Seward Prosser committee set goal of finding employment for 20,000. Have been successful in securing positions for over 10,000. City of New York established free unemployment bureau and have placed large number of persons in

position without any fee to applicant. There is much distress existing in city. Benefits are being held and proceeds given to buy coal, food, and provide shelter for those unemployed.

JAMES C. QUINN.

PROVIDENCE, R. I., December 10, 1930.

President WILLIAM GREEN,
American Federation of Labor, Washington, D. C.:

Replying your telegram of December 9, unemployed in this city too great to give a clear estimate. Providence labor greatly handicapped by out-of-town help being brought in on contract work. Hunger, fuel, and lack of employment working great hardship on countless numbers; charitable organizations taxed to limit; bread-line groups of men in all walks of life. Number of unemployed increasing daily as per report at meeting of central federated union held on this date. Manufacturers' agreement with President Hoover's plan being violated to a great extent. Only the fact that winter is mild is the greatest help to our people. Christmas buying very lax. Requests for assistance at every meeting; for example, will report 97 per cent of musicians unemployed.

WILLIAM J. FALLON,
Secretary Providence Central Federated Union.

MANCHESTER, N. H., December 10, 1930.

WILLIAM GREEN,
American Federation of Labor Building:

Unemployed 3,000. Road, sewer, and parks and playground using about 600 workers. Distress and suffering exists. City government providing free fuel. Municipal relief fund started by the sale of relief bonds to amount of \$10,000. Building-trades workmen hard hit. No relief provided and nothing doing on new Government post-office building.

C. E. YOUNG,
Secretary-Treasurer Manchester Central Labor Union.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., December 11, 1930.

Mr. GREEN,
American Federation of Labor, Washington, D. C.:

Ten thousand or more through-chamber of commerce all people working for city 1 per cent of their salary. Widespread distress and suffering exists. Yes; people are suffering from hunger, lack of clothing, fuel, and shelter and protection.

EMIL SALSBUARY,
Secretary Indianapolis Central Labor Union.

The Senator had better have one of those Department of Commerce "scouts" go out to Indianapolis and see what the situation is.

Mr. WATSON. I am in touch with that situation.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE (reading):

KANSAS CITY, Mo., December 11, 1930.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President American Federation of Labor,
American Federation of Labor Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Estimated 20,000 unemployed; 1,000 listed with one agency only able to place 169 temporary jobs. Considerable suffering, lack of food, clothing, and fuel; wages of those engaged in industry far too low to encourage contribution, yet sacrifice has been made. Lack of employment has worked hardships on business in general.

MAX DYER,
Secretary Central Labor Union.

KANSAS CITY, KANS., December 11, 1930.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President American Federation of Labor,
Washington, D. C.:

Over 5,000 unemployed in Kansas City, Kans. Soup line established at free employment bureau. Widespread distress and suffering exists among men, women, and children for lack necessities of life. Deporable condition growing steadily as winter advances. No relief in sight.

W. E. JONES,
Recording Secretary Central Labor Union,
Kansas City, Kans.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

WILLIAM GREEN,
American Federation of Labor Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Our estimate unemployed men in Los Angeles seventy to seventy-five thousand. No good data available as to women. Charity relief being extended through county charities and community-chest agencies, but distress is widespread throughout the entire vicinity and our observation convinces that hundreds of cases are never recorded and publicity concerning the volume is withheld. There is positively a great deal of suffering from hunger and lack of proper clothing here. As to shelter, hundreds are drifting into auto camps and other cheap-rent places. County and city governments, with citizens' committees, are endeavoring to formulate plans for employment.

J. W. BUZZELL,
Secretary Central Labor Council.

LOUISVILLE, KY., December 11, 1930.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President American Federation of Labor,
Washington, D. C.:

Your wire 9th, recent registration by city of unemployed shows 11,100. This represents little better than 50 per cent of unemployed. State, city, and labor groups cooperating to alleviate suffering. Distress and suffering exists at present and will be widespread before winter is over. City operating free-employment bureau, endeavoring to place unemployed even on odd jobs. Coal being distributed by city, and to a certain extent people are suffering from lack of clothing, fuel, and shelter. Our figures for Louisville show at least 55 per cent organized labor out of work; possibly 10 per cent of this number on part-time basis.

ALEXANDER JEFFREY.

MEMPHIS, TENN., December 10, 1930.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President American Federation of Labor,
American Federation of Labor Building:

Approximately 15,000 unemployed in Memphis. Suffering intense. Emergency committee appointed by mayor working to relieve situation. No outlook for immediate future. Trades council working in conjunction with committee.

E. E. BARNUM, JR.,
Secretary Memphis Trades and Labor Council.

GREENSBORO, N. C., December 10, 1930.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President American Federation of Labor,
Washington, D. C.:

Thirty-five hundred to 4,000 unemployed here. Eighty-five per cent of skilled labor in building trades idle most of time since January. Much suffering among men, women, and children, especially textile and common labor. Central labor union employment bureau registered 500 first week operated. City and county agency registered about same number. Many registering every day from practically every walk of life. Food, clothing, and fuel badly needed. Children in textile villages unable to attend school because of lack of shoes and money to buy books. Welfare department refuses to aid families who have joined union.

GREENSBORO CENTRAL LABOR UNION,
MARCUS F. SAULS, Secretary.

BALTIMORE, MD., December 11, 1930.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President American Federation of Labor:

Approximately 25,000 unemployed with at least 15,000 on part-time basis. Total affected, 40,000. Voluntary applications to city charities increasing at rate of 20 per cent per month. Skilled trades show conservative average of 60 per cent unemployed.

HENRY F. BROENING.

PASSAIC, N. J., December 10, 1930.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President American Federation of Labor,
Washington, D. C.:

Approximate number unemployed in this industrial center placed at 8,000. About 1,500 are building-trades and miscellaneous trades mechanics. Relief furnished through mayor's relief committee, poor department, Red Cross, holding of food shows, and private sources. Distress and suffering exists in many cases, with additional reported every day. Twenty-four cases reported to-day. An idea of the need of relief can be had from the fact that the city has made an emergency appropriation of \$30,000 for relief work, which is not in the city budget.

C. J. WALSH, Secretary.

COLUMBIA, S. C., December 10, 1930.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President American Federation of Labor,
Washington, D. C.:

One thousand eight hundred unemployed in Columbia and about 3,500 affected men, women, and children caused by this unemployment.

CITY FEDERATION OF TRADE,
J. W. GRIST, Secretary-Treasurer.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., December 11, 1930.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President American Federation of Labor,
American Federation of Labor Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Replying your wire of December 9, approximately 30,000 unemployed in San Francisco. There is much suffering and distress. Various charitable agencies busy ministering to needy and hungry, which is rather widespread. City council appropriating \$50,000 per month to relieve unemployment, a kitchen being established to feed those in need. Unemployed men and women are registering at the rate of 150 per day.

JOHN A. O'CONNELL,
San Francisco Labor Council.

TACOMA, WASH., December 11, 1930.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President American Federation of Labor,
Washington, D. C.:

Approximate number unemployed in Tacoma 5,800, including 1,800 organized workers. Usual relief work being conducted by organizations coming within scope of community chest. These organizations report considerable distress. City council and chamber of commerce urging citizenry to give all employment within their power. City council also endeavoring to promote additional improvement work.

JOSEPH TAYLOR,
Secretary Tacoma Central Labor Council.

DORCHESTER, MASS., December 10, 1930.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President American Federation of Labor,
Washington, D. C.:

Approximately 50,000 unemployed. City of Boston welfare department are supplying all needy families with food. They receive enough money to pay rent. There is no suffering amongst men, women, and children to my knowledge.

HARRY GRACES.

SPRINGFIELD, MASS., December 10, 1930.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President American Federation of Labor:

Approximately 10,000 people out of work in this city. No extreme suffering. City making supreme effort to take care of unemployed doing municipal work. Estimate about 2,000 trade-unionists out of work.

M. J. SCANLON,
President Central Labor Union.

SCHENECTADY, N. Y., December 11, 1930.

WILLIAM GREEN,
American Federation of Labor Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Conservative estimate Schenectady unemployed 4,000, of which half registered with city unemployment committee. Distress should depression continue. Committee put about 300 to work raising hundred thousand for relief.

HERBERT M. MERRILL.

SYRACUSE, N. Y., December 10, 1930.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President American Federation of Labor:

There are approximately 10,000 unemployed here in Syracuse. Relief is being furnished by charitable organizations, supported by community chest. Suffering has not as yet reached an acute state, but may do so when real cold weather sets in.

WILLIAM F. GOFF.

WHEELING, W. VA., December 10, 1930.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President American Federation of Labor,
Washington, D. C.:

Approximate number of unemployed in the city of Wheeling, 7,500. Various lodges and churches are doing wonderful work to aid the poor. No doubt there will be a great deal of suffering if conditions don't improve before the new year. We are not able to estimate the number of people who are suffering from hunger and the lack of clothing, but we presume there are many. This information will include all workers.

FRANK HEALEY,
Secretary Ohio Valley Trades and Labor Association.

FORT WAYNE, IND., December 12, 1930.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President American Federation of Labor:

Salvation Army, Rescue Mission, community chest, and other agencies estimate 8,000 unemployed. Seventeen hundred families in distress. No widespread suffering just now. Situation is being cared for by city and county officials. Governor's committee and other agencies estimated that when severe cold weather sets in that widespread hunger and suffering will prevail.

H. G. FLAUGH,
Fort Wayne Federation of Labor.

AUGUSTA, GA., December 10, 1930.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President American Federation of Labor,
Washington, D. C.:

Replying to telegram, approximately 2,000 unemployed locally. Cotton mills and other industries running four and five days. Situation, while serious, is not acute. Widespread actual distress and no bread lines. Civic organizations and central labor union have opened employment offices and have supplied temporary work for about 170 persons to date. Trust information meets your request.

MAX WILK.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., December 11, 1930.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President American Federation of Labor,
Washington, D. C.:

Answering your wire December 9, John Howe. Estimated number, 8,000. Situation not acute, but growing serious. Plans for emergency relief under way. City and state-wide relief committees appointed and working. No widespread suffering as yet.

W. A. PAT MURPHY,
Commissioner of Labor.

PORTLAND, OREG., December 12, 1930.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President American Federation of Labor,
Washington, D. C.:

Estimated unemployed in Portland, Oreg., 20,000. Concentrated drive being made by large civic committee headed by mayor and cooperated with by entire city is creating relief work quite rapidly. There is considerable distress and suffering, but it is not widespread, largely because the city is well organized for relief work. In addition to the usual agencies of relief in the form of food and clothing, we have a number of newly created organizations and movements sponsored by organizations, newspapers, theaters, etc., that are gathering food, clothing, and money to add to the relief work.

GUST ANDERSON.

DENVER, COLO., December 11, 1930.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President American Federation of Labor,
American Federation of Labor Building, Washington D. C.:

Approximately 20,000 unemployed workers in Denver. At present relief seems adequate from existing charitable and social agencies. January 15 appears will be beginning of real suffering here. Registration of unemployed will begin shortly by Y. M. C. A. and Y. W. C. A. Chamber of commerce has committee on unemployment at work; union labor represented on this committee. Unemployment problem is growing more serious daily.

RAY LOWDERBACK,
Secretary Denver Trades and Labor Assembly.

TOLEDO, OHIO, December 10, 1930.

WILLIAM GREEN,
American Federation of Labor Building
Washington, D. C.:

Approximately 18,000 workers out of employment in Toledo. Fifteen thousand additional only working part time. Civic relief organizations well organized, but funds available are inadequate. Much suffering and distress exists. Federal aid is badly needed.

JOHN J. QUINLIVAN,
Secretary Toledo Central Labor Union.

JACKSONVILLE, FLA., December 11, 1930.

WILLIAM GREEN,
American Federation of Labor Building,
Washington, D. C.:

There are approximately 3,000 workers idle. There is no great spread of distress and suffering. The community chest, civic organizations, and popular subscriptions are taking care of them. We can still use some Federal relief.

C. S. WEMP,
Central Labor Union.

WILMINGTON, DEL., December 9, 1930.

President WILLIAM GREEN,
American Federation of Labor Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Estimate unemployment Wilmington district 3,500, and am glad to report organization Mayor Forrests emergency unemployment relief committee, which to-day adopted plans for raising sufficient money, both to create employment and to extend unemployment relief. Wilmington plan is independent. Unemployment relief for families to be taken care of by mayor's committee through our efficient associated charities, while Salvation Army will apply relief to single men and women. Funds being collected people of all walks of life cooperating. Labor represented by central body secretary. Labor here believes in Nation in war time can command work or fight, then in peace time workers can require cooperation municipalities, State, and Federal Governments in making work and extending relief. We advocate building new Federal building here, badly needed, and congressional authorization proposed Delaware-New Jersey bridge, and support of Delaware congressional delegation of full Federal relief program, as workers want work, or else Government must cooperate with States and cities in relief, which means keeping families together intact and supplying full finances for shelter, food, heat, clothes, and necessities. Commend federation program, as it is what is needed to awaken Nation to responsibilities.

JOHN C. SAYLOR,
Secretary Central Labor Union.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., December 10, 1930.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President American Federation of Labor:

Approximately 130,000 unemployed in city. This don't include part-time workers. Citizens' committee organized to relieve dis-

tress. Have just begun activities; shelter for homeless men provided. Six thousand school children are fed every morning. It is estimated that 8,000 school children go without breakfast. Thousands of families are absolutely destitute. Organized charity is unable to provide; city council appropriated inadequate amount of \$150,000; promised more for future. Soup kitchens are prevalent throughout the city. Work rather than charity is desired.

FRANK BURCH.

KNOXVILLE, TENN., December 12, 1930.

WILLIAM GREEN,
American Federation of Labor Building
Washington, D. C.:

There are approximately 3,500 unemployed in Knoxville. There is quite a bit of suffering among the poorer class. No known evictions have been made. Skilled mechanics and other craftsmen are feeling the unemployment conditions. Some relief is being given the acute cases.

W. B. HATCHER, Secretary.

FALL RIVER, MASS., December 12, 1930.

WILLIAM GREEN,
President American Federation of Labor,
Washington, D. C.:

Approximately 15,000 workers unemployed; policemen, firemen, and other municipal employees contributing weekly to civic organization composed of labor union, churches, service clubs, and other organizations formed this month to handle situation. All cases called to public attention are being taken care of, and while situation is acute no need for people here to go hungry or in need of clothing.

J. F. REAGAN,
Secretary Central Labor Union.

Here is a telegram from Columbus, Ohio, dated December 12, addressed to me, as follows:

COLUMBUS, OHIO, December 12, 1930.

Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE,
Washington, D. C.:

Congress is about to vote millions for drought relief and unemployment. Coal camps situated mostly in isolated sections without hope of relief. There is desperate need of help. Is there no way extending Federal help for the long-suffering miners? Answer will be appreciated.

MINERS JOURNAL.

Mr. President, as I stated at the outset, with this information in my possession I could not let the assertion of the Senator from Indiana, that this situation was well in hand, that there was no serious condition of distress or suffering from lack of food, clothing, and shelter, go unchallenged.

We have waited for more than a year since the stock-market crash. So far no adequate plans have been formulated on the part of the Federal Government, nor has industry come forward with any plan for meeting this situation. I hope that when Senators are considering the problem of unemployment and its relief they will not fail to remember that, as a matter of fact, we are entering the second, not the first, winter of unemployment.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Something like two weeks ago the Senate passed a resolution requesting the President to send to the Senate the report of his unemployment commission. They were in session here for a long time, and conducted a survey of the unemployment situation, and I assume made some very valuable recommendations to the President, and I want to know whether we have that report now in response to the request of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No response has been made to the resolution of the Senate.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I have already stated that Congress should ascertain for itself on its own responsibility what these conditions are in the various sections of the country. I for one am no longer ready to take the assurance of any one man, no matter who he may be, that conditions are well in hand, when telegrams of this character, coming from central-labor bodies, which may be presumed to be more closely in touch with the situations in their various communities than Senators are, indicate that in many, many cities throughout the country there is actual suffering, distress, and want at this very hour.

I am sympathetic with the purposes of the resolution offered by the Senator from Minnesota. I hope that the Senate and the Congress will have the benefit of the report

which the President's unemployment commission, headed by Colonel Woods, has made.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HASTINGS. Assuming the facts indicated by these telegrams to be true, has the Senator from Wisconsin any particular remedy which he would recommend to the Senate?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I would support a bill or joint resolution to appropriate money out of the Treasury of the United States, under some such plan as that covered by the measure introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], rather than see men and women in this country go hungry, or suffer from privation and want of shelter, when they are suffering those consequences as a result of no fault of their own. As I said before the Senator from Delaware came in, if these four or five million unemployed and their dependents were suffering this privation, hardship, and want as a result of a physical earthquake, there is no question but that Congress would appropriate generously for their relief, but for some strange reason, because these citizens of the United States are suffering due to an economic disaster, Senators view relief from the Treasury of the United States as some mysteriously evil thing which they are pleased to term a "dole." No Senator rose on this floor when we appropriated \$100,000,000 in 1919 for European food relief and called it a dole. The people of America gave generously, and they approved of the action of the Congress and the President in thus coming to the relief of those victims of the war.

In 1921 we appropriated \$20,000,000 for the relief of Russians who were suffering from hunger and starvation as a result of the World War and of the civil war which followed it. Yet not a Senator rose on the floor of the Senate and denounced that as a dole, or as some evil project which would carry dire economic consequences to this country. When we appropriated \$6,000,000 for the relief of the sufferers from the earthquake in Japan in 1925 no Senator protested here, and there was a general approval of that action by the people of the country.

I take the position that it is the duty of Congress to ascertain what are the conditions in this country, and if there be want, hunger, and suffering from lack of food and shelter, as is indicated by these many telegrams which I have read, then I say it is the duty of Congress to meet the situation and to provide relief from the Treasury of the United States for these innocent victims of this economic disaster.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. President, has the Senator any evidence that any local community anywhere is not financially able to take care of the persons in want in that community, and does the Senator think that until that appears the Federal Government ought to participate in these contributions directly to the suffering people?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I think this is just as much a responsibility of the Federal Government as it is of any municipality or any State government. Upon what theory does the Senator from Delaware charge the sole responsibility up to the municipalities of his own State? Does the Senator think that the city of Wilmington is any more responsible for the economic situation in which we find ourselves now than is the Government of the United States? That seems to be a perfectly untenable position.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. President, can the Senator point out any instance in which the Federal Government has, during its whole history, in times of peace, undertaken to relieve distress, in a charitable way, with direct gifts to people?

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CARAWAY. I just wanted to call attention to the fact that even when a fire struck the city of Salem, Mass., the Congress of the United States made a direct appropriation for the relief of the city.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will read a list of some of the cases of relief, with which the Senator does not seem to be familiar:

1874, Mississippi River flood, \$190,000.
 1874, Mississippi River flood, \$100,000.
 1875, Grasshopper plague, \$150,000.
 1882, Mississippi River flood, \$100,000.
 1882, Mississippi River flood, \$150,000.
 1882, Mississippi River flood, \$100,000.
 1884, Ohio River flood, \$300,000.
 1884, Ohio and Mississippi Rivers flood, \$200,000.
 1890, Mississippi River flood, \$150,000.
 1897, Mississippi River flood, \$200,000.

Mr. HASTINGS. Of course, Mr. President, we all know that always in cases of floods and droughts the Congress has relieved, but I am asking whether, in an economic situation like the present one, Congress has ever appropriated money as a pure charity for people who are suffering from hunger?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will the Senator from Delaware explain, if he can, what difference it makes to a citizen of the United States, if he be homeless, without food and clothing, in the dead of winter, whether it is the result of a flood, or whether it is due to an economic catastrophe over which he had no control? I see no distinction, in so far as those who are suffering from this condition are concerned, and it is those people in whom I am interested and in whom I hope the Congress will become interested.

Furthermore, Mr. President, if we had never appropriated a nickel out of the Treasury of the United States in all our history, I do not think that would be a sound argument against the Congress in this hour doing whatever may be necessary to prevent large numbers of citizens of the United States from starving and freezing because of unemployment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does not the Senator also think that it is our duty to get this information right now, because does not the Senator think that the worst period of unemployment will be during the months of January, February, and March, perhaps, and if we can not get the President to send in the report of Colonel Woods, would it not be a proper thing for the committees of the Senate to have Colonel Woods come before them, and let them find out what the facts are and undertake to remedy them? Let us remedy the situation by giving the people work to do and not giving doles. Should not some such action be taken now?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, in so far as the actual situation during January, February, and March is concerned, very little Congress may do now, through the expansion of public works, will bring any assistance to these men and women and their dependents during the dead of winter. If a situation requiring action exists—and I am insisting that Congress ought to ascertain for itself and on its own responsibility whether or not it does exist—then, the only way in which we can give immediate and adequate relief is through a Federal appropriation.

Now, I want to continue, in reply to the inquiry of the Senator from Delaware, reading from this list of Federal appropriations which have been made to the people of this country suffering from disasters:

1897, Mississippi River flood, \$200,000.
 1897, Destitute persons in Alaska, \$200,000.
 1906, San Francisco fire, \$1,000,000.
 1906, San Francisco fire, \$1,500,000.
 1908, Southern cyclones, \$250,000.
 1912, Mississippi and Ohio River flood, \$1,239,000.
 1913, Flood and tornado relief, \$654,000.
 1913, Mississippi and Ohio River floods, \$130,000.
 1914, Salem, Mass., fire, \$200,000.
 1916, Floods in Southern States, \$540,000.
 1928, Mississippi River flood, \$1,500,000.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. GOFF. Is it not true that in all of the cases which the Senator has just read, which relate to earthquake or floods, the local communities were so destroyed as not to be capable of furnishing the very employment which the present localities are represented as being able to furnish in this emergency? If that distinction which I have pronounced in the question be true, then is not the position of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] the correct one, as well as the argument advanced by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], that until we are given assurance that the different localities can not meet this emergency brought about by universal depression, it is not the duty of the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds to meet the situation?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. O Mr. President, I make the same answer to the Senator from West Virginia that I made to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS]. As far as I am concerned, if the city of Wheeling, W. Va., does not come forward and take care of the unemployed and their dependents, if there be suffering there, as the secretary of the local labor council represents, if my recollection serves me correctly, then I would be in favor of the Federal Government sharing the obligation. I see no reason why the city of Wheeling and other cities, or the State itself, if you please, should be called upon to meet this obligation unaided by the Federal Government. Does the Senator think that the city of Wheeling, W. Va., is alone responsible for the unemployment in that city?

Mr. GOFF. I would say to the Senator that he has argumentatively answered my question in the affirmative, because I stated in the question that if it was in evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that the different localities could not raise the sums necessary to meet the depression, that then, as the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] said this morning, it would become the unquestioned duty of the Congress of the United States to step forward and aid the States. But until that fact is shown then I say it is the duty of the localities in the different States to meet the emergency.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Upon what theory does the Senator from West Virginia contend that this emergency should be met entirely by cities like Wheeling and others in his own State?

Mr. GOFF. For the simple reason that until they have shown an inability to cope with their State functions and the exercise of their State rights, the Congress of the United States, in my judgment, has no jurisdiction and no prerogative to enter the field and usurp or exercise the State sovereignty of any of the States of this Union.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Does the Senator from West Virginia think that the citizens of Wheeling would rise up and stand on their State's rights if the Federal Government offered to assist them 50-50 as provided in the bill introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] in helping to meet a situation which they did not themselves create?

Mr. GOFF. No; I do not say that they would do that.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think they will be surprised to find that the Senator from West Virginia, one of their representatives here, is pleading State's rights as a reason why the Federal Government should not come to the assistance of the distressed unemployed and their dependents in the State of West Virginia.

Mr. GOFF. Let me say to the Senator that I am not in the least concerned with either the surprise or the criticism of people in my own State or in any other State who happen to differ with my legal opinion honestly arrived at as to the functions of the States and the Federal Government. I am just as much interested in helping the people of the city of Wheeling as I am in helping the people of the city of New York or the people of any of the cities in the State of Wisconsin from which the Senator comes. But until it is shown that those rights can not be exercised by the State, then I say it is not the duty of the Federal

Government to step in and encroach upon the exercise of State sovereignty.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator does not contend, I take it, that there is anything in the Constitution which would prevent the Government of the United States from assisting the States and municipalities in this emergency?

Mr. GOFF. Oh, I do not see any clause in the Constitution that would prevent the Congress of the United States making donations if the Congress of the United States saw fit so to do.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The only thing that prevents the Senator from favoring any assistance at this time on the part of the Federal Government is his own opinion as to what are the functions of the State governments and what are the functions of the Federal Government.

Mr. GOFF. No; my difference goes back farther. The Senator from Wisconsin was stating to the Senate the instances in which the Congress had come forward with appropriations to assist the States, and I then pointed out that those instances arose in cases where the individual localities had been destroyed by what we term in the law an act of God, namely, a fire that swept a city, an earthquake, or a general flood, and when those communities were destroyed by this so-called act of God and could not come forward under the exercise of the rights of State sovereignty and meet the situation, that it was, of course, instantly the duty of the Federal Government to come into the breach and by due appropriation meet the requirements which had arisen.

I was asking the Senator if he made a distinction between an emergency of that character and an emergency like the present depression in which we have no evidence that the State governments and the municipalities are unable to meet the demand so made upon them. I think there is a very broad ground of distinction.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Of course there is a distinction, but so far as I am concerned personally, I see no reason why the Federal Government should not assist in this situation if it sees fit to do so, even though the municipalities and the various States are in a position to cope with the problem, because so far as that argument is concerned it must be predicated upon the theory that the responsibility rests first upon the city and State governments to meet the problem. I do not recognize that this is the correct position for this reason: This economic disaster, as everyone knows, was due to causes with which the municipalities and State governments had nothing to do. They were not responsible for bringing it on. In this discussion it is not my purpose to fix responsibility; but if any governmental entity is in part responsible for the present unemployment situation, it must be the National Government, which enacts legislation that affects financial, industrial, and economic conditions of the country.

But, Mr. President, it makes little or no difference to me whether the victims of this economic depression are suffering from a situation caused by the failure of industrial and financial leadership or lack of statesmanship in this country, or whether men and women are suffering from some act of God. The suffering is just as acute and the victims are as much in need of relief in the one case as in the other.

Mr. GOFF. I wish to point out to the Senator from Wisconsin this distinction which I think he will readily admit. If the Federal Government can intervene in the prerogatives of any State, whether it be the exercise of a State function or the exercise of a municipal function, in order to give to the community because the community is the beneficiary and donee, if we are going to expound and accept that doctrine, then we are dangerously close to the proposition that the Federal Government can go into any municipality or into any sovereign State and say, "While we have a right to come in and give, we also, under the exercise of that same prerogative, may come in and interfere and take away." I say that under those circumstances and conditions we are approaching a very dangerous ground in the present emergency.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. And yet the Senator says if the situation is shown that any community or any group of communities in this country can not meet the situation he will be perfectly willing to appropriate money for the purpose.

Mr. GOFF. I do say that.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I say that in that splitting of legal hairs and theories I am not the least bit interested.

Mr. GOFF. Of course, if the Senator is not interested in his own logical processes, because that is where they have led him, then he is not interested in the legal result.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HASTINGS. I want to inquire whether the Senator thinks it would be a practical thing to give Federal aid to any particular community which was not prosperous and was in need of help, excluding every other community, because this one needed it a little more than any other?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No, I assume that any immediate relief which is afforded would have to be upon some such basis as that indicated in the measure drawn by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH]. His measure proposes, as I understand it, to meet 50-50 with the municipalities or States the additional expense to which they have been put as a result of caring for the unemployed and needy in this economic situation.

Mr. HASTINGS. The particular thing I had in mind was, suppose we had an acute situation, for instance, in South Carolina and another in Massachusetts, while the balance of the country was prosperous; would the Senator believe that the Federal Government would be safe, upon the application of those two communities, in furnishing relief?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I would say to the Senator that I would be in favor of the Federal Government sharing in the relief if there was acute suffering and it was not being relieved otherwise.

Mr. HASTINGS. Does not the Senator think that if the Federal Government adopted the policy of relieving every community that needed to be relieved, we would soon find all of the communities turning that particular job over to the Federal Government and doing nothing on their own account?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think, of course, that the policy could be abused. I know of no policy which the Federal Government has that could not be abused in its application.

But we have gotten away from the situation at issue. I have submitted certain telegrams indicating that the statement made by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] is not correct—that there is no great suffering in the country due to unemployment and that the charitable relief agencies and the municipalities and States have the situation well in hand.

It is the responsibility of the Senate to ascertain whether there is actual suffering in the communities of the country, and if it be shown that there is widespread suffering and distress in the United States due to this unemployment situation, then, I think, it is the duty of the Congress to meet that situation by appropriate Federal action for the relief of the citizens of the country. Our responsibility now is to meet the emergency created by the unemployment situation and at the same time to formulate a constructive program of prevention.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask, as expressive of my views, to have inserted in the RECORD, following the able and very informative speech of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], an article published in the Evening Star and other papers, written by myself, upon request, on the subject of financing Federal aid to the unemployed, and also an editorial from America of December 13, 1930.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of December 15, 1930]

ONE-BILLION-DOLLAR UNITED STATES RELIEF LOAN IS URGED BY WALSH, IF NEEDED—MASSACHUSETTS SENATOR SAYS INTEREST CHARGE WOULD BE TRIVIAL TO PAY—ACTION IN BIG WAY ADVISED AS STIMULANT OF POPULAR CONFIDENCE

(At the request of the Evening Star and the North American Newspaper Alliance, Senator DAVID I. WALSH, Democrat, of Massachusetts, wrote the following article presenting his views regarding Government aid to the unemployed.)

By DAVID I. WALSH, United States Senator from Massachusetts

An emergency is defined as "an unforeseen occurrence or condition calling for immediate action." Wars produce emergencies; as do earthquakes, droughts, floods, plagues.

Who can doubt that the sudden denial, whatever may be the causes, to millions of human beings of the necessities of life through unemployment is an emergency of an extraordinary character?

In many respects it is the most destructive, distressing, and dangerous of all emergencies, because it creates a state of unrest, uncertainty, worry—in brief, a state of mind that invites the acceptance of dangerous social, political, and economic theories that may threaten free institutions.

War and most other emergencies are accompanied with a patriotic spirit that sustains and even infuses courage, patience, fortitude, and a spirit of self-denial. The fact that in most emergencies everyone tries to help and that all relief agencies move rapidly spreads hope and cheer. In economic emergencies we move hesitatingly and too often are indifferent and even unwilling to recognize existing conditions.

PROMPT ACTION ADVISED

Governments exist to serve the needs of the people. At no time should the Government respond to the service of rendering relief more promptly, directly, and adequately than in that emergency, which is accompanied with widespread unemployment and an economic debacle that embraces all the ills of other emergencies, but which lacks the sustaining spirit of endurance and patriotism that is concomitant to other crises.

During the World War we created a debt of approximately \$26,000,000,000 for winning the war—of conquering that great emergency. The present economic emergency will necessitate large expenditures upon the part of the Federal Government—as it has already required large expenditures on the part of municipalities and States—if the Federal Government recognizes, as it should, its obligation to serve the people's needs in a grave emergency.

Fortunately, at the very time when there is more unemployed and more real distress among the masses, money is more plentiful and cheaper than ever before. Only recently the Government borrowed money for 1½ per cent.

WOULD BORROW BILLION

To my mind the Federal Government should meet the present emergency by borrowing a billion dollars—if that amount be necessary—on a bond issue that would be tax exempt, carrying serial payments of \$100,000,000 each year after the first five years, until the issue is entirely paid off, which would be at the end of 15 years.

This issue of bonds would bear from 2¼ to 2½ per cent, and, being tax exempt, could readily be sold under present money conditions.

The loan might be termed an "unemployment emergency issue," the proceeds to be used immediately for Federal construction and improvements of a permanent nature throughout the 48 States, each State to be allotted for Federal construction and improvements and for sharing the extraordinary increased welfare work such an amount as would be its proportionate share based on population and necessary construction work to be done.

CONSIDERS INTEREST TRIVIAL

The consequent increase in taxes to meet the interest on this loan would be trivial. Furthermore, I believe the psychology of such a step would result in helping business recuperate.

It would help to put what is sometimes termed "other money" into real activity.

It would stimulate business all along the line, enhearten the business element, as well as the real victims of this emergency, thus giving courage to move forward, and finally would give unmistakable evidence that the Government of the United States is not soulless.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The editorial is as follows:

[From America of December 13, 1930]

THE PRESIDENT ON PUBLIC RELIEF

In his message of December 2 the President makes a number of statements with which we will all agree, and not a few which invite and even compel dissent. We learn nothing new when we are once more told that "our country is to-day stronger and richer in resources than ever in history." What we should like to be told is how those resources can be more widely distributed.

We know that we have more millionaires than any country on earth and that the per capita share in the national wealth reaches a very respectable figure. But our knowledge gives us small comfort when our actual share is about \$8.59, and we have reason to

fear that this is the last week in which our name will figure on the pay roll. On the very day on which the President spoke his words of comfort the Interstate Commerce Commission reported that, as compared with September, 1929, nearly a quarter of a million railroad workers had lost their jobs. And that is but one of a dozen facts which throw a few shadows on the picture of national prosperity painted by the President.

We are quite willing to accept the President's statement that "economic depression can not be cured by legislative action" and his deduction therefrom that "economic wounds must be healed by action of the cells of the economic body—the producers and consumers themselves." It is a principle of sane government that legislatures should not act to do for the individual or for social or economic groups into which he may enter what can be done by the individual himself or in partnership with his fellows. This is true both in a positive and negative sense, both in the sense of actual aid and of removing obstacles which impede individual and corporate action. Properly understood, the principle is essential to good government.

But it must not be pressed too far. In face of difficulties not to be removed by individual or corporate action, then the State is bound to act. It evades its duty when it meets the situation by quoting wise saws of the general tenor that the State must not debase the people by giving them too much bread and too many circuses or by announcing that economic depression can not be cured by legislative action. There is a sense in which the President's dictum is quite untrue. Depressions do not cause themselves. Back of every depression is a human act, and a human act presumes responsibility and a man or a set of men who can be called to account. And, all other powers failing, the State must do the calling.

As a matter of record, both the Federal and the State Governments recognize the existence of obligations in this chapter. None have lived up to their full obligations, but all admit the necessity of legislation to curb the corporation and business thief and so to equalize economic opportunities. Piratical practices which were customary in the economic world 60 years ago must now be garbed in the trappings of respectability if they are not to clap those who employ them in the penitentiary. We do not fear legislation, State and Federal, aiming at a larger distribution of wealth and equalizing economic opportunity, nor do we ask our lawmaking bodies to go beyond their constitutional limits. But we do expect them to do all that lies within a just and proper use of their powers to lift the burdens that now press sorely upon the back of the wage earner, and still more heavily upon the back of the man who is not a wage earner simply because he can not find a job.

The statement that "economic wounds must be healed by action of . . . the producers and consumers themselves" does not satisfy us. Nor will it satisfy until the Government, State and Federal, has met its obligation by enacting and consistently enforcing legislation calculated to foster a just distribution of the country's undoubted sources of wealth, to equalize economic opportunity, and to give to the poor the special protection of which they stand in need.

UNEMPLOYMENT AND DEPRESSION—NEW YORK STOCK EXCHANGE

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I want to give notice that on to-morrow, immediately after the approval of the Journal, I shall discuss one of the causes for unemployment and the financial depression from which we are now suffering—the New York Stock Exchange.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14246) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS] has asked unanimous consent to consider first the amendment striking out section 4 of the bill. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 68, after line 2, it is proposed to strike out:

SEC. 4. No appropriation in this act for the fiscal year 1932 shall be used during such fiscal year to increase the compensation of any position within the grade to which such position has been allocated under the classification act of 1923, as amended, nor to increase the compensation of any position in the field service the pay of which is adjustable to correspond so far as may be practicable to the rates established by such act as amended for the departmental service in the District of Columbia.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, section 4, which appears on the last page, page 68, of the pending bill, was adopted by the Committee on Appropriations of the House and by the House. It relates to increases in salaries of employees coming under the classification act. The effect of the provision, as adopted by the House, would be to make it impossible for employees in the classified service to receive any

salary increases whatever during the fiscal year covered by this bill. The House since approving section 4 of the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill, has reversed its attitude, and in the Interior Department appropriation bill has followed the law which permits advances or step-ups in the various grades, confining them, however, to one-third, or, say, 30 per cent of the amount which would be required to bring employees in the classified service up to grade; that is, up to the pay to which they are now entitled.

The House, I repeat, has reversed itself in the consideration of the Interior Department appropriation bill, and has provided the money necessary to take care of about 30 per cent of the advances which would be necessary to bring employees of the classified service up to grade.

If the Senate will first take action on section 4—and the amendment striking it out was adopted not only by the subcommittee but by the whole Committee on Appropriations by a unanimous vote of all present—it will simplify the consideration of the pending bill for in many cases the changes made from point to point involve simply small amounts of money appropriated to take care, under the provisions of the classification act, at least up to 30 per cent of the increases to which the employees are entitled under that act.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

Mr. PHIPPS. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Since the House has taken the position it has with reference to the Interior Department bill, and it being absolutely certain that the Senate is going to agree to it, and therefore this provision will become the law, I merely wish to say that it would be manifestly unjust not to modify this bill so as to treat all employees alike. I, therefore, hope that the Senate will adopt the unanimous report of the committee in favor of striking out this provision.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. PHIPPS. I yield.

Mr. KING. The Senator states that the legislation here recommended will bring the compensation of a large number of employees covered by the bill up to grade?

Mr. PHIPPS. No; it would grant about 30 per cent of the advances to which employees in the different classified grades are entitled under the law, and, in accordance with a 3-year policy, they would then all be brought up to grade. That is the policy it is hoped will be carried out.

Mr. KING. My recollection is that a number of years ago the classification act was passed, the object of which was to do away with the stepping-up and stepping-down process which had been pursued and which called for constant readjustment; and that when the classification act went into effect it immediately and automatically increased the compensation of all the employees of the Government who were in the civil service as well as of many who were not under civil service.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, in reality the classification act, as enacted, was an authorization; but the Congress has never voted the amounts of money necessary to carry out the provisions of the classification act. Even now we are only seeking to take care up to 30 per cent of the advances provided for under the classification act, figuring on a 3-year program to put the classification act into full effect.

Mr. KING. The Senator will recall that there was a great deal of criticism, some of which emanated, and I thought justly, from the Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART] of the classification act, because in its application those who received the largest salaries were unduly favored and those receiving intermediate or very small salaries were discriminated against. My understanding was that those in the upper grades received the full advance provided in the classification act and have been enjoying the full compensation ever since.

I notice, may I say, that in looking at the Budget, in some of the higher brackets, if I may use that expression,

the full amount of the grade is provided for the pending appropriation bill.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, as a matter of fact, there has been a provision written into every appropriation bill that keeps the allowance down to the average of the grade so that none of the holders of the high-salaried positions have been paid the full amount provided for.

As to the bill to which the Senator refers, namely, that introduced by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART], and which was adopted at the last session of Congress, amounts were appropriated to take care of a certain portion of the advances under the Brookhart bill. In the bills that came up for consideration covering positions affected by the Brookhart Act those positions were cared for. It is going to be necessary to take care of the remainder by legislation during the present session. The provisions of the Brookhart Act, so far as the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill now before us is concerned, are carried out.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator advise us as to the aggregate amount of increased compensation allowed to Federal employees by reason of the passage of this measure?

Mr. PHIPPS. Under the present bill, for the Treasury Department the aggregate is \$1,174,000, and for the Post Office Department, in which there are very few classified positions, the aggregate is only \$66,580. Including the other departments, the Interior Department, the Department of Commerce, the War and Navy Departments, and others, the aggregate will probably be about four and one-half million dollars to take care of 30 per cent of the advances allowed under the classification act.

Mr. KING. Then the classification act, speaking broadly, increased the compensation of Federal employees several hundred million dollars?

Mr. PHIPPS. The increase will amount to three times four and a half million dollars, or \$13,500,000.

Mr. KING. I said several hundred million dollars in the aggregate.

Mr. PHIPPS. Oh, no. As I have said, the increase would amount to \$13,500,000; but instead of granting the full amount this year's appropriation bills will cover about \$4,500,000.

Mr. KING. The Senator means all of the appropriation bills?

Mr. PHIPPS. All of them; yes.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator know what the cost is to the Government for all salaries of all its employees?

Mr. PHIPPS. The figures are not segregated, and I do not have them at my disposal at this moment. The Appropriations Committee will have them available; they can furnish that information to the Senator if he desires it.

Mr. KING. I have been advised that the salaries and compensation of Federal employees aggregate about \$1,000,000,000 per annum, which is about the entire cost of the Government in 1916. I should be very glad if before—

Mr. PHIPPS. Allow me to suggest to the Senator that he address a note to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations asking for such information as he would like to have and it will be promptly furnished.

Mr. KING. I was about to observe that I hope the Committee on Appropriations, before we conclude the consideration of the appropriation bills, will furnish that information.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I think the object of the committee here is to take care of advances within the grades. If there are several employees, one at \$700, one at \$800, one at \$900, and one at \$1,000, and the thousand-dollar man dies, if the provision which the committee has asked to be stricken out were to remain in the bill, it would mean that the thousand-dollar position would be filled from the lowest grade instead of promoting all along the line, which is the thing that gives incentive to good work in the departments. I have felt very much in sympathy with the proposal of the committee in striking the provision from the House bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee striking out section 4.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. May the Chair suggest that all items in the bill which are affected by the amendment just adopted should be agreed to en bloc. Is there objection to that course? The Chair hears none, and the amendments are agreed to.

The clerk will proceed with the other committee amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr President, may I ask if the formal reading of the bill may not be dispensed with?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That has been ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Can we not have the bill read merely for committee amendments?

Mr. PHIPPS. The order has been entered for the reading of the bill for committee amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the committee amendments.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 7, line 4, before the word "machines," to insert "and electrically powered typewriting," so as to read:

No part of any money appropriated by this or any other act shall be used during the fiscal year 1932 for the purchase of any standard typewriting machines, except bookkeeping and billing and electrically powered typewriting machines, at a price in excess of the following for models with carriages which will accommodate paper of the following widths—

And so forth.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Customs," on page 12, line 1, after the word "newspapers," to strike out "\$23,983,600" and insert "\$24,602,260," and in line 8, after the word "and," to strike out "\$476,870" and insert "\$482,270," so as to make the paragraph read:

Collecting the revenue from customs: For collecting the revenue from customs, for the detection and prevention of frauds upon the customs revenue, and not to exceed \$10,000 for the securing of evidence of violations of the customs laws, including expenses of transportation and transfer of customs receipts from points where there are no Government depositories, not to exceed \$79,200 for allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light, as authorized by the act approved June 26, 1930 (46 Stat. 818), not to exceed \$5,000 for the hire of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, and not to exceed \$500 for subscriptions to newspapers, \$24,602,260, of which such amount as may be necessary shall be available for the cost of seizure, storage, and disposition of any merchandise, vehicle and team, automobile, boat, air or water craft, or any other conveyance seized under the provisions of the customs laws, when the proceeds of sale are insufficient therefor or where there is no sale, and \$482,270 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia, exclusive of 10 persons from the field force authorized to be detailed under section 525 of the tariff act of 1930.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 17, after the name "District of Columbia," to insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That not exceeding \$10,000 may be expended for the collection and dissemination of information and appeal for law observance and law enforcement, including cost of printing, purchase of newspapers, and other necessary expenses in connection therewith; *Provided further*, That for purpose of concentration, upon the initiation of the Commissioner of Industrial Alcohol and under regulations prescribed by him, distilled spirits may be removed from any internal-revenue bonded warehouse to any other such warehouse, and may be bottled in bond in any such warehouse before or after payment of the tax, and the commissioner shall prescribe the form and penal sum of bond covering distilled spirits in internal-revenue bonded warehouses and in transit between such warehouses.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Narcotics," on page 20, line 6, after the words "in all," to strike out "\$1,708,528" and insert "\$1,719,688," and in line 7, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$211,620" and insert "\$214,500," so as to read:

Salaries and expenses: For expenses to enforce the act of December 17, 1914 (U. S. C., title 26, sec. 211), as amended by the revenue act of 1918 (U. S. C., title 26, secs. 691-708), the act approved February 9, 1909, as amended by the act of May 26, 1922

(U. S. C., title 21, secs. 171-184), known as the narcotic drugs import and export act, pursuant to the act of March 3, 1927 (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 5, secs. 281-281e), and the act of June 14, 1930 (46 Stat., pp. 585-587), including the employment of executive officers, attorneys, agents, inspectors, chemists, supervisors, clerks, messengers, and other necessary employees in the field and in the Bureau of Narcotics in the District of Columbia, to be appointed as authorized by law; the securing of evidence of violations of the acts; the costs of chemical analyses made by others than employees of the United States; the purchase of such supplies, equipment, mechanical devices, books, and such other expenditures as may be necessary in the several field offices; cost incurred by officers and employees of the Bureau of Narcotics in the seizure, storage, and disposition of property under the internal revenue laws when the same is disposed of under section 3460, Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 26, sec. 1193); hire, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles when necessary; and for rental of necessary quarters; in all, \$1,719,688, of which amount not to exceed \$214,500 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury may authorize the use, by narcotic agents, of motor vehicles confiscated under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1925 (U. S. C., title 27, sec. 43), as amended, and to pay the cost of acquisition, maintenance, repair, and operation thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 13, after the word "thereof," to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That not exceeding \$10,000 may be expended for the collection and dissemination of information and appeal for law observance and law enforcement, including cost of printing, purchase of newspapers, and other necessary expenses in connection therewith.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 13, to insert:

For establishing and equipping new Coast Guard stations on the sea and lake coasts of the United States, as authorized by law, \$143,500, to be available until expended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, I do not think that we are really justified in going quite so fast, as certain explanations are necessary. This item is "for establishing and equipping new Coast Guard stations on the sea and lake coasts of the United States, as authorized by law, \$143,500, to be available until expended." The item was estimated for, and the amendment is one which the Senate committee thought should be incorporated in the bill.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask whether the proposed amendment on page 20, relative to the Bureau of Narcotics, has been adopted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has been adopted.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado if he regards it as wise to make the departments school teachers and give them funds with which to disseminate information?

Mr. PHIPPS. That is not the exact and entire purpose and intent. The fact is that it is necessary for the Bureau of Narcotics to employ a number of agencies throughout the country, enforcement officers, and have them familiar with the law and methods of procedure and judicial or court action in the prosecution of cases. This \$10,000 is permissive to that extent. It enables them to print a pamphlet for which they find a demand for about 600,000 copies. They go to all of their headquarters and to their agents. The committee had a hearing on that subject, and was convinced that it was a proper function.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that the proof was very full and very specific. The bureau showed that these pamphlets were in great demand, and that they sent them out by the hundreds of thousands. It seems to me that both these amendments ought to be agreed to—the one in reference to the narcotic law and also the one as to the prohibition law, which is found on the preceding page, page 18, I believe. The Senator will find that they are companion provisions—one for prohibition-law observance and the other for narcotics. I believe great good will come from the amendment, and I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, when my eye caught these amendments I had in mind the effort which was made some time ago by one of the bureaus to set up a sort of school-teachers' organization in the Treasury Department; and some woman possessed of great zeal, but I think with little knowledge, prepared some charts and so-called educational matter to be sent out to the people to teach them law enforcement and law observance. So far as I am concerned, I believe, of course, in law enforcement and law observance; but I do not want to endow every department of the Government with authority to commit to some bureaucratic chief the power to formulate plans and schemes which they regard as educational, but which do not have the sanction of law, and then send them out throughout the United States.

The Senator has called attention to the provision on page 18—

That not exceeding \$10,000 may be expended for the collection and dissemination of information—

There is no objection to that.

and appeal for law observance and law enforcement.

Of course we believe in law enforcement and law observance; but I do not think the Senate and the Congress and the people believe that it would be wise to submit to all of the departments the unlicensed authority to formulate what they conceive to be proper remedies for evils that may exist, and prepare appeals to the people with regard to law enforcement and law observance.

One employee may feel that a certain policy should be pursued in order to enforce a law. Another employee may believe that a different policy should be pursued. Under measures of this kind we will have authority given to bureaus and bureau chiefs and employees of the Government to frame what they conceive to be proper methods of enforcement and proper educational methods to teach law enforcement. Each one will be the judge of how the law should be enforced. We will have conflict and confusion if we say that it is the policy of the Government to give to each executive department and bureau unlicensed authority to issue publications in regard to law observance and law enforcement.

While the object undoubtedly is proper, and while we all desire law enforcement and law observance, I doubt the wisdom of saying to the bureaus, "You are to determine what instructions should go forth in regard to law enforcement and law observance." Not content with promulgating the law and the regulations which may be prepared pursuant to the law, we go farther now and say to the departments, "You are to judge of what is good law enforcement, and what instructions should go to the people in order to bring them to a proper appreciation of the attitude, not of the lawmakers but of the bureaus that are charged with the enforcement of the law."

I think this will be a very bad precedent; and we will find that every department will be asking for authority to promulgate instructions, which will be sent out by the bureau chiefs or some employees of the Government, and each one will have a different plan and a different conception as to the best way of effectuating the desired result.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, may I say that I am very glad to have the views of the Senator from Utah. The committee unanimously desired to put these two paragraphs into the bill after having hearings at which the heads of these two bureaus appeared and gave their reasons for desiring this authority. The committee favors it, and would like to take these items to conference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, there is so much noise and confusion in the Senate that it is utterly impossible for anyone occupying a seat in the back row to know what is going on. I wish to inquire what amendment was just voted on.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment just disposed of was on page 20, beginning on line 13.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 25, line 3, before the word "remain," to insert "be immediately available and to," so as to read:

Coast Guard Academy: For completing the construction and equipment of buildings and appurtenances for the Coast Guard Academy authorized in the act entitled "An act to provide for the acquisition of a site and the construction thereon and equipment of buildings and appurtenances for the Coast Guard Academy," approved February 16, 1929 (45 Stat. 1189), and the act entitled "An act to change the limit of cost for the construction of the Coast Guard Academy," approved April 7, 1930 (46 Stat., p. 145), including the preparation of necessary plans, drawings, designs, specifications, and estimates, \$1,640,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, at the end of line 18, to increase the appropriation for pay of acting assistant surgeons (noncommissioned medical officers) from \$395,784 to \$404,584.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, at the end of line 20, to increase the appropriation for pay of all other employees (attendants, etc.) from \$1,098,490 to \$1,128,790.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Mints and assay offices," on page 36, line 23, after the name "Colorado," to insert "Carson City, Nev.," in line 25, after the name "New York," to insert "Boise, Idaho, Helena, Mont., Salt Lake City, Utah,"; and on page 37, at the end of line 10, to strike out "\$1,550,540" and insert "\$1,579,480," so as to make the paragraph read:

For compensation of officers and employees of the mints at Philadelphia, Pa., San Francisco, Calif., Denver, Colo., Carson City, Nev., and New Orleans, La., and assay offices at New York, N. Y., Boise, Idaho, Helena, Mont., Salt Lake City, Utah, and Seattle, Wash., and for incidental and contingent expenses, including traveling expenses, new machinery, and repairs, cases and enameling for medals manufactured, net wastage in melting and refining and in coining departments, loss on sale of sweeps arising from the treatment of bullion and the manufacture of coins, not to exceed \$500 for the expenses of the annual assay commission, and not exceeding \$1,000 in value of specimen coins and ores for the cabinet of the mint at Philadelphia, \$1,579,480.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 50, line 14—

Mr. PHIPPS. Those four amendments were provided for in the blanket amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. They were all agreed to en bloc.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the First Assistant Postmaster General," on page 56, line 15, to reduce the appropriation for compensation to postmasters and for allowances for rent, light, fuel, and equipment to postmasters of the fourth class from \$53,500,000 to \$53,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 5, to increase the appropriation for allowances to third-class post offices to cover the cost of clerical services from \$8,700,000 to \$8,800,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 14, to reduce the appropriation for village delivery service in towns and villages having post offices of the second or third class, and in communities adjacent to cities having city delivery, from \$1,600,000 to \$1,500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, at the end of line 17, to reduce the appropriation for car fare and bicycle allowance, including special-delivery car fare, from \$1,450,000 to \$1,400,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General," on page 64, line 15, after the word "exceed," to strike out "\$710,000" and insert "\$711,800," so as to read:

For the purchase, manufacture, and repair of mail bags and other mail containers and attachments, mail locks, keys, chains, tools, machinery, and material necessary for same, and for incidental expenses pertaining thereto; also material, machinery, and tools necessary for the manufacture and repair in the equipment shops at Washington, D. C., of such other equipment for the Postal Service as may be deemed expedient; for compensation to labor employed in the equipment shops at Washington, D. C., \$2,350,000, of which not to exceed \$711,800 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, on page 61, line 20, there is an appropriation of \$20,000,000 for the inland air service.

Transcontinental air lines cross the country to all the main points on the Pacific except along the northern way from St. Paul and Minneapolis to Seattle. This matter was brought up in the committee. As chairman of the committee, there being no Budget estimate for it, I felt that I should not offer the amendment. The committee, however, went into the situation pretty fully. It was found that the Post Office Department had recommended to the Budget some twenty-one and odd million dollars for this service, and included in that was the establishment of this transcontinental air service across the northern part of the United States.

The committee went into the matter quite fully. It was also disclosed that under what is known as the Watres Act—I think that is the name of it—the policy of the department will be changed after the 1st of July, and these new routes can not be established except out of the funds of the air mail service. The committee considered the situation fully and came to the conclusion that this line should be established.

There are many cities of considerable size along this northern route, and the committee unanimously authorized me to offer an amendment appropriating \$750,000 that would be used by the department in inaugurating this line along the northern part of the United States from St. Paul and Minneapolis to Spokane and Seattle. So, under that action of the committee, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk. My colleague [Mr. DILL] also presented this matter fully to the subcommittee a few days ago.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, the Senator stated that the committee authorized him to offer the amendment. Does that imply that the committee favored the amendment or that it merely authorized the bringing of the question before the Senate?

Mr. JONES. No; I think the committee was practically unanimous for the amendment.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Why did not the committee include the amendment in the bill as reported?

Mr. JONES. As I say, it was not estimated for by the department; it had not been estimated by the Budget; and, at any rate, that was the action of the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the amendment is adopted it will just add another one to the list of projects shown on page 155 of the House hearings?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Under those circumstances it seems to me that it ought to be allowed, because it has been recommended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 61, line 10, strike out "\$20,000,000" and insert "\$20,750,000."

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, I desire to state that the committee heard the department on this subject, heard one of the Senators—the Senator from Washington [Mr. DILL]—and the committee were of opinion that it should be included. It was only the desire to keep the total appropriation to \$20,000,000 that resulted in the elimination of this item from the program of the Post Office Department. So far as I am concerned, I should like to see the item included in the bill; and I shall be glad to take it to conference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I desire to prefer a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I shall object to the unanimous-consent request presented by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. DILL. I merely desire to say that I wanted to have inserted in the RECORD the testimony I had given before the committee. It would save my making any remarks. But, if the Senator from Georgia is going to object to any unanimous-consent request in the Senate of that kind, of course he may do so.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator from Georgia will decide that for himself. The Senator from Washington objected to the confirmation of the widow of a United States Senator from my State, who has been in the Postal Service for 12 years and has rendered most excellent service. This is, as I remember, the only time I have ever objected to a unanimous consent when requested by a Senator, and I would not do so at this time except for the Senator from Washington objecting to my request.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 60, line 14, to strike out "\$7,000,000," and insert in lieu thereof "\$7,345,000."

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, this would not increase any appropriation. It would merely permit the Postmaster General, in the allocation of his funds for foreign mails, to extend the international air mail figure. The Postmaster General is interested in doing this, if possible, in order to cover into the American system the reciprocal mail route with the Mexican Government.

The amendment has been discussed with the chairman of the subcommittee and with the chairman of the full committee. Unfortunately, the subject did not arise in time to be taken before the full committee. I think both Senators are willing to take the amendment to conference, where the matter can be investigated at greater length.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may the amendment be again stated?

The amendment was again stated.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, I may explain that that item is the permissible amount which may be devoted out of the lump sum for the purpose of carrying foreign mails by airplane. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to have the item go to conference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan proposes the same amendment on line 17, to strike out "\$7,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$7,345,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, by way of further explanation of the amendment just voted on, and for the information of the conference, I ask that the statement I send to the desk respecting the two amendments just agreed to be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The proposed amendment does not increase the appropriation for foreign mails by one dollar. It only changes the qualifying clause, which prescribes how much of the total appropriation for all foreign mails may be expended for international air mail.

The amendment will enable the Postmaster General to reciprocate with the Mexican Government, which for 21 months has been defraying the cost of forwarding international air mail northbound to the United States through El Paso, where direct connection is made with the new southern transcontinental domestic air-mail route. Thus, international air mail southbound

from the United States will be carried over the same air line, the Corporacion Aeronautica de Transportes, which serves daily 17 of the largest cities in Mexico, including the great central valley, where the principal mining, smelting, agricultural, and timber operations are located. It is reported that approximately \$900,000,000 of American capital are invested along this route and that the tributary population totals 4,300,000, of whom about 16,000 are resident Americans.

The route is in the form of a cross flying from El Paso through Torreon to Mexico City. At Torreon two branch lines connect—one west to Mazatlan, on the Gulf of California, and one east to Matamoros, near the Gulf of Mexico. It serves a territory not competitive with the Pan American route. Three thousand eight miles are flown daily, the total mileage of successful operation for the past 21 months approximating 1,500,000 miles. The line is 98 per cent American owned and is considered an economic necessity, particularly to the extensive mining and other American operations. I am told that the Post Office Department considers this service a very desirable addition to our air mail system. Unquestionably it will aid in promoting friendly trade relations with our sister Republic to the south.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 24, at the end of line 16, to strike out the period and insert a comma and the words:

Thirty-five thousand dollars thereof to be available for the construction and equipment of the Coast Guard station on the coast of Green Bay at or in the vicinity of Strawberry Passage, in Door County, Wis., at such point as the commandant of the Coast Guard may recommend, as authorized by the act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Coast Guard station on the coast of Green Bay at or in the vicinity of Strawberry Passage, in Door County, Wis.," approved September 21, 1922.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, this amendment was incorporated in the appropriation bill at the last session, but was stricken out in conference.

The Coast Guard station to which reference is made was authorized by an act of Congress in 1922, eight years ago. There is a great necessity for that station, which arises from the fact that Green Bay, an arm of Lake Michigan, has a coast line of about 200 miles, and there are no Coast Guard stations on the bay.

The testimony presented before the committees of Congress in 1922 showed that there is a great deal of commerce carried on Green Bay. The bay is shallow in comparison with Lake Michigan or the ocean, and there have been a great many shipwrecks on that body of water. Twenty-three lives have been lost in the vicinity of Strawberry Passage, all of which might have been saved if there had been a near-by life-saving station such as is furnished by the Coast Guard.

There are 20 ports on Green Bay. During the vacation season in the neighborhood of over half a million people visit this portion of Wisconsin and Michigan, and during that time sailing and boating is a pastime with them. It has been known that children have lost their lives in the vicinity of this bay. So the need and demand for this life-saving station is imperative from the standpoint of the saving of life, and also for the protection of commerce upon this mighty bay, which is an arm of Lake Michigan.

There are 200 miles of coast line without any protection whatever, and a half million people visit that section on their vacations. There is a great deal of commerce there, and the evidence shows that 23 lives have been lost, most of which could have been saved had there been a life-saving station at or near this point.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BLAINE. I yield.

Mr. PHIPPS. No witness appeared before the committee requesting this appropriation. I was wondering whether the Senator could tell us why it was not recommended by the department and why an item covering the matter was not sent up from the Budget and included in the bill. The Senate committee was entirely without information regarding the proposed station.

Mr. BLAINE. Of course, I do not follow the hearings of the Committee on Appropriations. I have not the time, serving on a great number of the standing committees and some special committees. I probably might have informed

the committee about the matter, but the Commandant of the Coast Guard, Mr. Billard has recommended the establishment of this station year in and year out, and surely anything I could have said before the committee would not have had the force and effect of the recommendations of Commandant Billard. This station has been recommended by Mr. Billard, the records disclose, down to at least the last year or two. I do not know whether there has been any recommendation made respecting any Coast Guard station at this point since then or not.

Mr. PHIPPS. In so far as I may, I will be willing to accept this amendment and take the matter to conference. I should have to inform myself as to the necessity of the station.

Mr. BLAINE. I do not like to have the Senator just accept the amendment for the purpose of having it go to conference, where, I am assured from the outset, it will be stricken from the bill.

Mr. PHIPPS. There is no occasion for saying that, because when conferees appointed on the part of the Senate take amendments into conference, they stand for the views of the Senate in so far as they can for as long as they can.

Mr. BLAINE. I want the Senate to understand that my only interest in this amendment is that we may prevent the loss of life at that place. It seems to me that the Budget Bureau finds plenty of money for every sort of undertaking, but when it comes to the question of preserving and protecting human life, then the economies of the administration are drawn into force and effect in order to have conference committees strike proper amendments from bills. This is an amendment looking to the protection of life, not of the people of Wisconsin alone, but 500,000 people come from all over the United States and visit this section, and they are entitled to this protection. Twenty-three lives have been lost in this area, and I have no doubt but that most of them could have been saved had the recommendation of Commandant Billard been carried out years ago.

I would like to have a vote upon this amendment, and if the conference committee takes the matter out, we may then debate it further.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I desire to offer another amendment.

The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 66, at the end of line 5, to insert the following proviso:

Provided, however, That no part of said sum shall be paid as rental on the lease of any quarters for the housing of Government-owned automobiles unless the lease therefor contains a provision that the lease shall be canceled whenever the Government has available a Government-owned building for the housing of Government-owned automobiles: And provided further, That no lease for said purpose shall be entered into until there have been competitive bids submitted under the same terms and conditions as far as applicable as competitive bids are now required for the construction of Government buildings under the jurisdiction of the Treasury Department.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, I consider that a proper amendment. I think it should be incorporated in the bill.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, I ask that the clerks be authorized to make the necessary changes and corrections in totals.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, I call the attention of the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] to the fact that I have the figures about which the Senator inquired. I find that the total amount of salaries provided for the current fiscal year in the District of Columbia alone is \$103,000,000, in round figures, and in the field, outside of the District of Columbia, \$288,185,000, in round figures, or a total of \$391,185,000. That is everything in the way of salaried positions in the Government service, for personal services.

Mr. KING. Does that include payments made by the War Department for all of its activities?

Mr. PHIPPS. Excepting to enlisted men. It certainly would not cover enlisted men.

Mr. KING. I want to ask the Senator what excuse there is for the constant increase in the amount appropriated for the Bureau of Customs, notwithstanding the present tariff law, which will materially diminish the number of imports and consequently the receipts. I find that the appropriations exceeds that of last year by \$22,602,160. May I say that in 1925, when the collections were much greater than they will be during the coming year, the appropriations amounted to \$16,061,000; in 1920, to \$16,000,000—I give the round figures plus; in 1927, to \$19,000,000; in 1928, to \$17,000,000; in 1929, to \$20,925,000; in 1930, to \$22,292,000; and for 1931 the amount is \$22,602,000.

In other words, as the customs receipts are being diminished—that is, they will be diminished in the coming year—we are appropriating a larger sum for their collection. I can not understand the justification for an increase of \$6,000,000, from \$16,000,000 plus to \$22,000,000 plus, from 1925 to 1931. It seems to me there is no justification for that great increase. Not being a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I, of course, have not had the opportunity to find out whether there are ample reasons to justify such an enormous increase in the appropriation.

While I have the floor I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Internal Revenue Bureau appropriations were enormous, \$34,400,000. Notwithstanding collections for the coming year will be less than in the preceding year, the appropriations are substantially the same. We have been told as an excuse for the enormous appropriations for the Internal Revenue Bureau that they were engaged in ascertaining those who have defaulted in making payments, but as soon as they had cleared the books, so to speak, and brought the accounts to a condition of currency, then there would be a great reduction in the amount appropriated for that bureau. But we find such is not the case. In 1928 \$33,000,000 was appropriated; in 1929, \$34,000,000; in 1930, \$34,000,000; and this year \$34,000,000. It seems to me the Internal Revenue Bureau is extravagant, if not wasteful, in its activities and that there ought not to be any reason for such enormous appropriations for the collections in that bureau.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KING. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator knows that under the law the Treasury Department is not subject to be investigated by any other power. In other words, the Comptroller General of the United States has control of all the other departments and may investigate as to the proper expenditure of money therein, but the Treasury Department is an exception to that rule. That is under an amendment to the law adopted in a revenue act several years ago.

Mr. KING. It seems to me, in view of the statement made by the Senator, that there ought to be some independent legislation to correct that evil.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course; that law should be repealed. There is no reason in the world why the Treasury Department should not undergo the same rigid inspection by the Comptroller General of the United States that all other departments do. The law is different, however.

Mr. KING. I hope the Senator will introduce a bill respecting the reform to which he refers and that it will go to the Committee on Finance, where I feel sure it will be sustained.

Mr. President, I want to express my disapproval of the enormous amounts which are appropriated for the two bureaus to which I have referred. I am not in a position to offer an amendment because I have not sufficient information, but I do feel that these two bureaus are receiving under this bill amounts largely in excess of what is reasonable and just.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is still before the Senate for amendment. If there be no further amend-

ments, the question is, Shall the amendments be engrossed and the bill be read a third time?

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

RECESS

Mr. McNARY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) took a recess until to-morrow, Tuesday, December 16, 1930, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 15, 1930

CONSUL GENERAL

Henry H. Balch, of Alabama, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a consul, to be a consul general of the United States of America.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Carroll C. Hincks, of Connecticut, to be United States district judge, district of Connecticut, to succeed Warren B. Burrows, resigned.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Philip H. Mecom, of Louisiana, to be United States attorney, western district of Louisiana. (He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 12, 1930.)

REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE

Richard P. Imes, sr., of Montana, to be register of the land office at Billings, Mont., vice Harry B. Drum, deceased.

Murdock D. Nicholson, of Montana, to be register of the land office at Great Falls, Mont. (Reappointment.)

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Carl Voegtlin to be a pharmacologist director in the grade of medical director in the Public Health Service, to take effect from date of oath.

COAST GUARD

Kenyon Spalding to be a temporary ensign in the Coast Guard of the United States, to take effect from date of oath.

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE ARMY

TO FIELD ARTILLERY

First Lieut. Louis William Haskell, Infantry, with rank from March 6, 1928, effective June 10, 1931.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY

To be colonel

Lieut. Col. Walter Eugene Gunster, Infantry, from December 10, 1930.

To be lieutenant colonel

Maj. Melvin Guy Faris, Infantry, from December 10, 1930.

To be major

Capt. Irvin Vorus Todd, Finance Department, from December 10, 1930.

To be captain

First Lieut. Harry Gage Montgomery, Air Corps, from December 10, 1930.

To be first lieutenants

Second Lieut. Gustavus Wilcox West, Cavalry, from December 6, 1930.

Second Lieut. George Peter Berilla, jr., Cavalry, from December 10, 1930.

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATIVE CORPS

To be first lieutenant

Second Lieut. Douglas Hall, Medical Administrative Corps, from December 4, 1930.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

Rear Admiral William V. Pratt to be Chief of Naval Operations in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of

admiral, for a term of four years from the 17th day of September, 1930.

Capt. Clarence S. Kempff to be a rear admiral in the Navy from the 5th day of June, 1930.

Capt. John Halligan, jr., to be a rear admiral in the Navy from the 14th day of July, 1930.

Capt. William T. Tarrant to be a rear admiral in the Navy from the 1st day of October, 1930.

Capt. George T. Pettengill to be a rear admiral in the Navy from the 16th day of October, 1930.

Capt. Edward B. Fenner to be a rear admiral in the Navy from the 1st day of November, 1930.

The following-named commanders to be captains in the Navy from the 10th day of May, 1930:

Douglas L. Howard.

Arthur L. Bristol, jr.

Commander Walter H. Lassing to be a captain in the Navy from the 11th day of May, 1930.

The following-named commanders to be captains in the Navy from the 5th day of June, 1930:

Ross S. Culp.

Frank J. Fletcher.

The following-named commanders to be captains in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1930:

John H. Towers.

Milo F. Draemel.

Julian H. Collins.

Walter F. Jacobs.

Commander Leo F. Welch to be a captain in the Navy from the 14th day of July, 1930.

The following-named commanders to be captains in the Navy from the 1st day of September, 1930:

Turner F. Caldwell.

Earl R. Shipp.

The following-named commanders to be captains in the Navy from the 1st day of October, 1930:

Charles M. Austin.

Ferdinand L. Reichmuth.

Commander Harvey Delano to be a captain in the Navy from the 16th day of October, 1930.

Lieut. Commander Lyal A. Davidson to be a commander in the Navy from the 19th day of January, 1930.

Lieut. Commander Edwin J. Gillam to be a commander in the Navy from the 11th day of March, 1930.

Commander Thomas Moran to be a commander in the Navy from the 10th day of May, 1930, to correct the date from which he takes rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

Lieut. Commander Chester C. Jersey to be a commander in the Navy from the 11th day of May, 1930.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy from the 5th day of June, 1930:

Frank H. Kelley, jr.

Francis P. Traynor.

James A. Logan.

Howard B. Berry.

James T. Alexander.

Henry B. Cecil.

Francis A. La Roche.

Lieut. Commander Spencer S. Lewis to be a commander in the Navy from the 10th day of June, 1930.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1930:

Walden L. Ainsworth.

Roy C. Smith, jr.

Edward K. Lang.

James G. Ware.

Charles A. Pownall.

Lieut. Commander Lawrence F. Reifsnider to be a commander in the Navy from the 14th day of July, 1930.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy from the 1st day of September, 1930:

Frederick G. Reinicke.

Miles P. Refo, jr.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy from the 1st day of October, 1930:

Edgar M. Williams.

Howard A. Flanigan.

Marc A. Mitscher.

Lieut. Commander Scott B. Macfarlane to be a commander in the Navy from the 16th day of October, 1930.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy, to rank from the dates stated opposite their names:

Laurence E. Kelly, November 7, 1929.

Moses B. Byington, jr., March 31, 1930.

Frank R. Dodge, April 1, 1930.

Vincent R. Murphy, April 13, 1930.

Charles W. Styer, May 10, 1930.

Thomas L. Sprague, May 10, 1930.

Einar R. Johnson, June 5, 1930.

Martin J. Connolly, June 5, 1930.

Pal L. Meadows, June 5, 1930.

Frederick S. Holmes, June 5, 1930.

Thomas B. Inglis, June 5, 1930.

John J. Ballentine, June 5, 1930.

John R. Sullivan, June 5, 1930.

John D. Alvis, June 5, 1930.

George C. Cummings, June 5, 1930.

Clifton A. F. Sprague, June 10, 1930.

Clifton E. Denny, June 30, 1930.

Joseph J. Clark, July 1, 1930.

George C. Hawkins, July 1, 1930.

Rollin Van Alstine Failing, July 1, 1930.

Albert M. Bledsoe, July 1, 1930.

Harold Biesemeier, July 1, 1930.

John J. Bartholdi, July 1, 1930.

Stanley D. Jupp, July 1, 1930.

Albert F. France, jr., July 1, 1930.

Walter S. Macaulay, July 1, 1930.

Staley H. Gambrill, July 1, 1930.

David E. Cummins, July 14, 1930.

Julian D. Wilson, July 25, 1930.

Wilber M. Lockhart, August 1, 1930.

James L. Fisher, August 1, 1930.

Henry Y. McCown, August 1, 1930.

George William Johnson, September 1, 1930.

Jacob H. Jacobson, September 13, 1930.

Ion Pursell, October 1, 1930.

Gordon Rowe, October 1, 1930.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy, to rank from the dates stated opposite their names:

George T. Boldizar, August 31, 1929.

Sherman R. Clark, October 13, 1929.

John E. Murphy, November 20, 1929.

James E. Baker, January 16, 1930.

Henry E. Eccles, February 4, 1930.

Harry B. Jarrett, March 5, 1930.

Worthington S. Bitler, March 6, 1930.

Alexander F. Junker, March 11, 1930.

Hugh W. Hadley, March 17, 1930.

Gerald U. Quinn, April 1, 1930.

Kenneth O. Ekelund, April 1, 1930.

Robert A. J. English, April 1, 1930.

Carlisle H. Thompson, April 6, 1930.

Karl A. Thieme, April 6, 1930.

Harold C. Patton, April 13, 1930.

William C. Cross, April 18, 1930.

John P. Bennington, April 23, 1930.

Frederick S. Hall, May 2, 1930.

Luther B. Stuart, May 10, 1930.

Ralph Earle, jr., May 16, 1930.

John L. Pratt, May 16, 1930.

Charles W. Crawford, May 16, 1930.

John P. W. Vest, May 27, 1930.

John Y. Dannenberg, June 1, 1930.

Albert K. Morehouse, June 1, 1930.

Thomas D. Wilson, June 1, 1930.

Joseph B. Dunn, June 1, 1930.

Kenmore M. McManes, June 2, 1930.

George L. Menocal, June 2, 1930.

Francis B. Johnson, June 2, 1930.

William B. Terrell, June 2, 1930.

Donald W. Gardner, June 2, 1930.

Hallock G. Davis, June 2, 1930.

Ralph H. Wishard, June 2, 1930.
 Hugh W. Lindsay, June 2, 1930.
 Alfred J. Homann, June 5, 1930.
 Harold R. Stevens, June 5, 1930.
 Walter W. Rockey, June 5, 1930.
 Daniel W. Harrigan, June 5, 1930.
 William P. Davis, June 5, 1930.
 Francis J. Mee, June 5, 1930.
 John G. Mercer, June 5, 1930.
 Albert E. Chapman, June 5, 1930.
 Daniel B. Candler, jr., June 5, 1930.
 Harry R. Carson, jr., June 5, 1930.
 Frank T. Ward, jr., June 5, 1930.
 Robert W. Haase, June 5, 1930.
 Harry Sanders, June 5, 1930.
 Warren S. Parr, June 5, 1930.
 John W. King, 3d, June 5, 1930.
 Selden B. Spangler, June 5, 1930.
 Edward C. Loughhead, June 5, 1930.
 Frederick K. McElroy, June 5, 1930.
 Joseph N. Wenger, June 5, 1930.
 Thomas C. Evans, June 5, 1930.
 Richard G. McCool, June 5, 1930.
 Albert C. Murdaugh, June 5, 1930.
 Merrill K. Kirk Patrick, June 5, 1930.
 William V. O'Regan, June 5, 1930.
 John G. Crommelin, jr., June 5, 1930.
 William B. Ammon, June 5, 1930.
 Roland N. Smoot, June 5, 1930.
 Henry D. Wolleson, June 10, 1930.
 Paul C. Wirtz, June 21, 1930.
 Melish M. Lindsay, jr., June 29, 1930.
 Neil K. Dietrich, June 30, 1930.
 Charles W. Humphreys, July 1, 1930.
 Charles H. Momm, July 1, 1930.
 John R. Johannesen, July 1, 1930.
 McFarland W. Wood, July 1, 1930.
 William H. von Dreele, July 1, 1930.
 Alfred C. Olney, jr., July 1, 1930.
 Frank V. Rigler, July 1, 1930.
 Marshall M. Dana, July 1, 1930.
 Stewart Lindsay, July 1, 1930.
 William A. Riley, July 20, 1930.
 Elliott B. Strauss, July 25, 1930.
 James H. Thach, jr., August 1, 1930.
 John M. Ocker, August 1, 1930.
 Harold D. Krick, August 1, 1930.
 Arleigh A. Burke, August 1, 1930.
 Howard M. Kelly, August 1, 1930.
 Edward S. Pearce, August 1, 1930.
 Le Merton E. Crist, jr., August 1, 1930.
 Elbert L. Fryberger, September 1, 1930.
 Gordon J. Crosby, September 1, 1930.
 Robert L. Dennison, September 13, 1930.
 Roland M. Huebl, October 1, 1930.
 Daniel F. J. Shea, October 1, 1930.
 Stanhope C. Ring, October 10, 1930.
 Paul F. Dugan, November 1, 1930.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 3d day of June, 1929:

Frederick Mackle, jr.	William A. Gerth.
John C. Eakens.	Lloyd J. S. Aitkens.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 2d day of June, 1930:

John W. Bays.	Welton D. Rowley.
Herbert C. Zitzewitz.	James V. Rigby.
Lawrence R. Daspit.	James E. Cohn.
Samuel H. Crittenden, jr.	Richard H. Phillips.
Kenneth A. Knowles.	Clifford S. Cooper.
James H. Hogg.	William P. Chilton.
Paul H. Ramsey.	William M. Nation.
Albert B. Scoles.	William H. Organ.
David W. Tolson.	William T. McGarry.
Jack S. Holtwick, jr.	Selman S. Bowling.
Eliot Olsen.	Cornelius S. Seabring.
John C. Bernet.	William C. Bryson.

Ernest W. Lamons.	Leon J. Barbot.
Cecil T. Caufield.	Charles B. Beasley.
Joseph R. Hamley.	John T. Corwin.
Joseph N. Murphy.	Clayton R. Dudley.
John C. Broach.	Richard D. Zern.
Charles M. Heberton.	John L. De Tar.
David B. Overfield.	John A. Edwards.
Alan B. Sutherland, jr.	Robert B. Alderman.
Harold S. Harnly.	Thomas L. Greene.
Ralph Hickox.	William L. Knickerbocker.
Robert H. Rice.	James A. Prichard.
Harlan M. Thorpe.	Tyrrell D. Jacobs.
Carl F. Stillman.	James L. Shank.
Benjamin E. Moore, jr.	Emmanuel T. Goyette.
Leonard C. Chamberlin.	Howard W. Gordon, jr.
Delbert F. Williamson.	Paul R. Drouilhet.
Harold L. Tallman.	Creed C. Burlingame.
James A. Haley, jr.	Arthur K. Ehle.
Henry B. Stanley.	James W. Blanchard.
Halle C. Allan, jr.	Arthur C. W. Baskin.
Frederic A. Berry, jr.	Robert M. Barnes.
Theodore C. Fauntz.	Harold P. Richards.
Loren A. Morris.	Charles L. Melson.
Harry J. Ward.	Edwin W. Herron.
Roger F. Scott.	Thomas O. Oberrender, jr.
Herbert F. Eckberg.	Ross R. Kellerman.
John William Murphy.	Harold M. Zemmer.
William C. Specht.	Theodore O. Dahl.
James A. Jordan.	David C. White.
George L. Heath.	Lawrence M. Jensen.
John C. Zahm.	Gerald R. Dyson.
Harry R. Horney.	Joe W. Boulware.
Daniel T. Eddy.	Emmett J. Sullivan.
Jack Maginnis.	Charles K. Bergin.
Edward H. Eckelmeyer, jr.	Robert E. Dixon.
Brooke Schumm.	George L. Hansen.
Richard W. Smith.	Richard B. Levin.
George K. Fraser.	Frank Turner.
Carl L. Steiner.	Ulysses S. G. Sharp, jr.
Hilfort C. Owen.	Eugene E. Lindsey.
Kenton E. Price.	Philip A. Tague, jr.
Thomas B. Klakring.	Leo W. Nilon.
William Loveland.	Robie E. Palmer.
Alexander M. Kowalzyk, jr.	Wayne T. Stuke.
John L. Ewing, jr.	James S. Willis.
Alden D. Schwarz.	Louis P. Fairlamb.
James G. Holloway, jr.	Robert Brodie, jr.
Jesse Blackwell.	Frederic S. Habecker.
Rawson Bennett, 2d.	Robert F. Martin.
Thomas L. Mayo.	Farar B. C. Martin.
Howard W. Taylor.	Paul L. High.
James J. McKinstry.	Gregory A. Ladd.
Harold M. Briggs.	Hysell P. Cooper.
Perry K. Jeanes.	Howell J. Dyson.
Carl R. Midtlyng.	Edward S. Addison.
Lester J. Geiger.	Willard A. Saunders.
Martin P. Hottel.	Blinn Van Mater.
Christian H. Duborg.	Loring O. Shook.
James R. McCormick.	Theodore S. Dukeshire.
Otis C. Gregg.	George D. Dickey.
Jack F. Bowling, jr.	William F. Royall.
William E. Ferrall.	Thomas B. Neblett.
Martin J. Lawrence.	Newlin Neuhauser.
Robert S. Quackenbush, jr.	Thomas M. Dykers.
Edmund T. Napier, jr.	Arthur G. Bruner.
Walter H. Price.	Floyd C. Camp.
Martin R. Stone.	Mitchell D. Matthews.
Daniel J. Weintraub.	Frank Bruner.
Robert L. Densford.	Eugene B. McKinney.
Leland R. Lampman.	Thomas J. Flynn.
Jack P. Monroe.	Alfred R. Truslow, jr.
Herbert L. Hoerner.	Walter C. Winn.
Edward K. Shanahan.	Frank T. Corbin.
Charles P. Hill, jr.	John Eldridge, jr.
Harry F. Bauer.	Harry H. McIlhenny.
John F. Henkel.	Albert R. Heckey.
Gill M. Richardson.	Edwin B. Robinson.

Lucius H. Chappell, jr.
 John E. Fitzgibbon.
 Levi J. Knight, jr.
 Joseph J. Carey.
 Wayne R. Loud.
 Louis T. Malone.
 John R. Waterman.
 Eugene F. McDaniel.
 Louis H. Hunte.
 Courtney Shands.
 George Knuepfer.
 Stanley E. Judson.
 Herbert D. Riley.
 Jules F. Schumacher.
 Roland F. Pryce.
 Eugene L. Luginbuhl.
 Edwin K. Ponvert.
 Robert V. Hull.
 Edward J. Drew.
 Francis W. McCann.
 Arthur D. Marks.
 Julian D. Greer.
 Albert E. Fitzwilliam.
 William R. Caruthers.
 Joseph D. Danhoff.
 Joe Taylor.
 Renwick S. Calderhead.
 Philip H. Ross.
 Chesley M. Hardison.
 Thomas H. Massie.
 Leonard B. Southerland.
 Frank Virden.
 William R. D. Nickelson, jr.
 Myron W. Graybill.
 Robert J. Foley.
 Harry L. Hicks.
 David B. Coleman.
 Henry J. Armstrong, jr.
 Charles L. Freeman.
 William S. Harris.
 Carl M. Dalton.
 Robert T. Symes.
 Claren E. Duke.
 William H. Potts.
 William H. Brockman, jr.
 John G. McClaughry.
 William R. Ignatius.
 Arthur H. Taylor.
 Charles J. Skelly.
 William E. Kaltner.
 Bernard M. Gates.
 George A. Lewis.
 Leonidas W. Pancoast.
 Alan R. Montgomery.
 William A. Deam.
 Harry J. Hardwick.
 Malen Durski.
 Harry M. Denty.
 Michael P. Russillo.
 Granville A. Moore.
 Gus B. Lofberg, jr.
 Joseph B. Maher.

Ensign Elmer O. Davis to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 4th day of June, 1930.

Ensign William S. Maxwell to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 15th day of September, 1930.

Medical Inspector Frank X. Koltes to be a medical director in the Navy, with the rank of captain, from the 11th day of May, 1930.

The following-named assistant surgeons to be passed assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 5th day of June, 1930:

James R. Fulton.	Bernard S. Pupek.
Ralph H. Hofer.	Henry W. Patton.
James C. Drybread.	David W. Lyon, jr.

Robert N. Downes.
 Edward P. Southwick.
 Gordon S. Everett.
 John C. Atkeson.
 Elmer G. Cooper.
 James J. McRoberts.
 John E. Clark.
 Marion M. Byrd.
 Ray A. Mitchell.
 Harry R. Hummer, jr.
 William A. Sutherland, jr.
 Thomas C. Green.
 John O. R. Coll.
 John S. Thach.
 Francis R. Jones.
 Henry M. Marshall.
 Robert A. Allen.
 Andrew B. Buttrey.
 Arthur F. Anders.
 Ethan W. Allen.
 Donald G. Burt.
 John S. Tracy.
 George B. H. Stallings.
 William D. Irvin.
 Charles W. Parker.
 Alex McL. Patterson.
 David W. Shafer.
 Claude L. Weigle.
 Gordon L. Caswell.
 Robert E. Braddy, jr.
 Milton T. Dayton.
 Julius F. Way.
 Clarence E. Boyd.
 James K. Averill.
 Curtis A. Myers.
 Albert B. Mayfield, jr.
 George A. Lange.
 Glenn W. Legwen, jr.
 Glynn R. Donaho.
 Alston Ramsay.
 Paul D. Gross.
 Oscar H. Dodson.
 James P. Walker.
 Edward R. Johnson.
 John W. Chittenden.
 Charles E. Harrison.
 Paul F. Johnston.
 Charles J. Hardesty, jr.
 William M. Gullett.
 John H. Cross.
 Oscar W. Pate, jr.
 Richard E. Myers.
 Wilton S. Heald.
 Jimmie R. Simpson.
 John J. Branson.
 Calvin E. Wakeman.
 George W. Willcox.
 Joseph R. Rubins.
 Frank D. Giambattista.
 Thurston B. Clark.
 Samuel H. Griffin, jr.
 Albert S. Carter.

Hugo O. G. Wagner.
 Rufus A. Schneiders.
 Charles G. McCormack.
 Melvin D. Abbott.

Bruce V. Leamer.
 LeRoy F. Farrell.
 David O. Zearbaugh.

Passed Assistant Dental Surgeon John W. Grassl to be a dental surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, from the 7th day of July, 1930.

The following-named assistant dental surgeons to be passed assistant dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 5th day of June, 1930:

William R. Burns.
 Daniel W. Ryan.

The following-named citizens to be assistant dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 8th day of July, 1930:

Charles F. Lynch, a citizen of New Jersey.
 Curtiss W. Schantz, a citizen of Wisconsin.
 Francis V. Lydon, a citizen of Massachusetts.
 Albert E. Howell, a citizen of North Carolina.

Warren DeF. Sargeant, a citizen of Iowa, to be an assistant dental surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 17th day of July, 1930.

Mack Meradith, a citizen of Oklahoma, to be an assistant dental surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 1st day of November, 1930.

Pay Director Joseph J. Cheatham to be a pay director in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, from the 7th day of December, 1926.

Passed Assistant Paymaster Albert R. Schofield to be a paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, from the 31st day of August, 1929.

The following-named passed assistant paymasters to be paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, from the 7th day of January, 1930:

Robert L. Mabon.	Ernest M. Cronin.
Samuel B. Deal, jr.	Raymond V. Adams.

Passed Assistant Paymaster James D. Boyle to be a paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, from the 5th day of June, 1930.

Lieutenant (Junior Grade) Noble W. Lowrie to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from the 2d day of June, 1930.

Chief Pay Clerk Cecil O. Hamrick to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, from the 8th day of August, 1930.

Pay Clerk Robley E. Brown to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, from the 8th day of August, 1930.

James W. Boundy, a citizen of Washington, to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy with the rank of ensign, from the 29th day of August, 1930.

Willard C. Johnson, a citizen of Washington, to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, from the 11th day of October, 1930.

Thomas L. Becknell, jr., a citizen of Georgia, to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, from the 9th day of August, 1930.

James H. Payne, jr., a citizen of Massachusetts, to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, from the 20th day of August, 1930.

Onnie P. Lattu, a citizen of California, to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, from the 11th day of November, 1930.

The following-named acting chaplains to be chaplains in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 5th day of June, 1930:

Colonel H. Mansfield.
 Raymond B. Drinan.

The following-named assistant naval constructors to be naval constructors in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 23d day of June, 1930:

Richard M. Watt, jr.	Charles D. Wheelock.
Robert K. Wells.	Oliver D. Colin, jr.
Mortimer E. Serat, jr.	Paul E. Pihl.
Ralph E. McShane.	William C. Powell.

The following-named boatswains to be chief boatswains in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 9th day of August, 1930:

Paul Smith.	Wilbur A. Therien.
Raymond V. Svendsen.	Edward J. McBride.
Alvin E. Bernson.	Francis E. Dowd.
Theron D. Carter.	Winfred B. Coats.
Edward H. Wootan.	Herman B. Conrad.
William C. Kasmire.	

Electrician Paul MacKay to be chief electrician in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 1st day of April, 1930.

The following-named electricians to be chief electricians in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 7th day of August, 1930:

Emil A. Rensch.	Samuel J. Schoenfeld.
Charles D. Koon.	William W. Townsend.
Franklin M. Lewis.	Charles C. Camara.
George Trauth.	

Radio Electrician Chester S. Denton to be a chief radio electrician in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 28th day of February, 1927.

The following-named radio electricians to be chief radio electricians in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 8th day of November, 1929:

Raymond C. Taylor.
Luke W. DuFresne.

Machinist Thomas E. McDonald to be a chief machinist in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 10th day of January, 1930.

The following-named machinists to be chief machinists in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 30th day of July, 1930:

Harry Melker.	John Sogorka.
Robert G. Weedon.	William C. Wilson.
Jasper M. Cook.	Elmo C. Lake.

Machinist Frank M. Hendricks to be a chief machinist in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 15th day of September, 1930.

The following-named pay clerks to be chief pay clerks in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 14th day of August, 1930:

Richard B. Murto, jr.	Walter M. Rotsten.
Walter A. Joyce.	Cannie A. Anderson.
Jack McCleery.	William Ward.
Ernest W. Bolton.	John W. Thomas.
Theodore B. Purvis.	Alexander J. Howard.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenants in the Navy, from the dates stated opposite their names to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

Willard J. Suits, June 3, 1929.
Chauncey Moore, June 6, 1929.
Robert B. Higgins, jr., June 13, 1929.
Howard E. Orem, June 15, 1929.
Bates H. Johnston, June 16, 1929.
Eugene E. Elmore, June 18, 1929.
Clarke H. Lewis, June 30, 1929.
Lloyd D. Follmer, July 1, 1929.
Clifford M. Alvord, July 16, 1929.
Walter E. Gist, July 26, 1929.
Charles A. Havard, August 1, 1929.
Thomas T. Beattie, August 2, 1929.
Charles O. Humphreys, August 6, 1929.
George R. Cooper, August 16, 1929.
Valvin R. Sinclair, September 1, 1929.
Harry Keeler, jr., September 6, 1929.
Augustus D. Clark, September 6, 1929.
Charles O. Comp, September 16, 1929.
Edward B. Arroyo, September 24, 1929.
Malcolm M. Gossett, September 27, 1929.
Jesse G. Coward, October 1, 1929.
Robert B. Rothwell, October 1, 1929.
Vernon Huber, October 10, 1929.
Peter J. Neimo, October 11, 1929.
Howard B. Hutchinson, October 13, 1929.
Halstead S. Covington, October 22, 1929.

Horace B. Butterfield, November 1, 1929.
John P. Cady, November 4, 1929.
Edwin E. Woods, November 4, 1929.
Edwin V. Raines, November 7, 1929.
Hubert W. Chanler, November 8, 1929.
Edward H. Pierce, November 10, 1929.
Raymond H. Tuttle, November 15, 1929.
Frank Akers, November 26, 1929.
William R. Terrell, December 7, 1929.
William B. Whaley, jr., December 11, 1929.
Robert C. Strong, jr., January 7, 1930.
Charles M. Furlow, jr., January 8, 1930.
Edward R. Durgin, January 9, 1930.
Frederick J. Eckhoff, January 9, 1930.
Leon J. Manes, January 12, 1930.
Robert A. Knapp, January 16, 1930.
Louis D. Libenow, January 19, 1930.
Rudolf L. Johnson, January 30, 1930.
Anthony R. Brady, February 1, 1930.
Arthur L. Pleasants, jr., February 7, 1930.
Beverly E. Carter, February 10, 1930.
Herbert E. Berger, February 16, 1930.
Roland P. Kauffman, February 17, 1930.
James G. Sampson, March 1, 1930.
Harry St. J. Butler, March 9, 1930.
Delbert S. Cornwell, March 16, 1930.
Byron S. Anderson, March 31, 1930.
Thomas Aldred, April 9, 1930.
Malcolm W. Pemberton, May 10, 1930.
John L. Nestor, June 1, 1930.

Commander Isaac C. Kidd to be a captain in the Navy from the 1st day of November, 1930.

Lieut. Henry E. Thornhill to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 1st day of September, 1930.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Thomas H. Kehoe to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 11th day of March, 1930.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Richard C. Scherrer to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 21st day of May, 1930.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 2d day of June, 1930:

Liles W. Creighton.
Bosquet N. Wey.

Boatswain Lester R. Kaldenbach to be a chief boatswain in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 9th day of August, 1930.

Machinist Walter E. Kelly to be a chief machinist in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 30th day of July, 1930.

Pay Clerk Leigh W. Haydon to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 14th day of August, 1930.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Washington H. Carlisle to be postmaster at Alexander City, Ala., in place of W. M. Carlisle, appointee declined.

Clifford T. Harris to be postmaster at Columbia, Ala., in place of C. T. Harris. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1930.

Lillian R. Maugans to be postmaster at Eufaula, Ala., in place of L. R. Maugans. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1930.

Mary J. Anthony to be postmaster at Guin, Ala., in place of M. J. Anthony. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1930.

Silas E. Sanderson to be postmaster at Leighton, Ala., in place of S. E. Sanderson. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1930.

Emmett C. Sellers to be postmaster at McKenzie, Ala., in place of B. F. Beesley. Incumbent's commission expired February 23, 1930.

Frank F. Crowe to be postmaster at Montevallo, Ala., in place of F. F. Crowe. Incumbent's commission expires December 20, 1930.

William R. Bailey to be postmaster at Newbern, Ala., in place of W. R. Bailey. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1930.

ARIZONA

John Caretto to be postmaster at Bisbee, Ariz., in place of C. W. Hicks. Incumbent's commission expired June 30, 1930.

Charles J. Alden to be postmaster at Globe, Ariz., in place of C. J. Alden. Incumbent's commission expires December 20, 1930.

ARKANSAS

Raymond M. Jackson to be postmaster at Biscoe, Ark., in place of R. M. Jackson. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1930.

John L. Callahan to be postmaster at Booneville, Ark., in place of J. L. Callahan. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1930.

Perry W. Hampton to be postmaster at Glenwood, Ark., in place of P. W. Hampton. Incumbent's commission expired June 12, 1930.

Eston G. Berry to be postmaster at Magazine, Ark., in place of E. G. Berry. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1929.

Lindley M. Osborne to be postmaster at Marianna, Ark., in place of S. G. Helm, resigned.

CALIFORNIA

Walter S. Sullivan to be postmaster at Agnew, Calif., in place of W. S. Sullivan. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1930.

Edward F. Hopkins to be postmaster at Arroyo Grande, Calif., in place of E. F. Hopkins. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

Elmer B. Whitson to be postmaster at Balboa, Calif., in place of E. B. Whitson. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

Howard C. McCaughey to be postmaster at Bodega, Calif. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Fred W. Stein to be postmaster at Camarillo, Calif., in place of F. W. Stein. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1930.

Harry C. Smith to be postmaster at Campbell, Calif., in place of H. C. Smith. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1930.

James A. Lewis to be postmaster at Carpinteria, Calif., in place of J. A. Lewis. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

Gilbert M. Aylesworth to be postmaster at Cupertino, Calif., in place of G. M. Aylesworth. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1930.

Harrison P. Gower to be postmaster at Death Valley, Calif., in place of F. W. Corkill, resigned.

Noah A. Mackey to be postmaster at Imperial, Calif., in place of N. A. Mackey. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1930.

Phyllis V. Gleason to be postmaster at King City, Calif., in place of P. V. Gleason. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

Norman F. Densmore to be postmaster at Laton, Calif., in place of N. F. Densmore. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1930.

Frank S. Farquhar to be postmaster at Livingston, Calif., in place of F. S. Farquhar. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1930.

Don C. Saunders to be postmaster at Lompoc, Calif., in place of D. C. Saunders. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1930.

Ida P. Naylor to be postmaster at Newport Beach, Calif., in place of I. P. Naylor. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

Clarence L. Pratt to be postmaster at Pacific Beach, Calif., in place of C. L. Pratt. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1930.

Florence E. Cornelius to be postmaster at Piru, Calif., in place of F. E. Cornelius. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1930.

James B. Rickard to be postmaster at Santa Barbara, Calif., in place of J. B. Rickard. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1930.

Frederic W. Stahler to be postmaster at Yorba Linda, Calif., in place of F. W. Stahler. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1930.

COLORADO

Ethel R. Quinn to be postmaster at Cheyenne Wells, Colo., in place of E. R. Quinn. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1930.

William H. Cochran, jr., to be postmaster at Del Norte, Colo., in place of W. H. Cochran, jr. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Barnett F. Greene to be postmaster at Dolores, Colo., in place of B. F. Greene. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1930.

John W. Moore to be postmaster at Las Animas, Colo., in place of J. W. Moore. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

John C. Callaghan to be postmaster at Westcliffe, Colo., in place of J. C. Callaghan. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

CONNECTICUT

Charles K. Bailey to be postmaster at Bethel, Conn., in place of C. K. Bailey. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1930.

Elbert B. Austin to be postmaster at Cromwell, Conn., in place of E. B. Austin. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1930.

Archibald Macdonald to be postmaster at Putnam, Conn., in place of Archibald Macdonald. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1930.

Edmund E. Crowe to be postmaster at South Norwalk, Conn., in place of E. E. Crowe. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1930.

FLORIDA

Edward S. French to be postmaster at Belleview, Fla., in place of E. S. French. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

James C. Young to be postmaster at Dunnellon, Fla., in place of G. J. Pedrick. Incumbent's commission expires December 18, 1929.

Burdett Loomis, jr., to be postmaster at Pierce, Fla. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Ida V. Dalton to be postmaster at Vernon, Fla., in place of I. V. Dalton. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

GEORGIA

Annie K. Bunn to be postmaster at Cedartown, Ga., in place of A. K. Bunn. Incumbent's commission expires December 22, 1930.

Sherril T. Fassister to be postmaster at Cornelia, Ga., in place of J. H. Foster. Incumbent's commission expired June 7, 1930.

Mrs. Alexander S. Clay to be postmaster at Marietta, Ga., in place of Mrs. A. S. Clay. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

IDAHO

Oliver E. Norell to be postmaster at Mountain Home, Idaho, in place of O. E. Norell. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1930.

Warren P. Jones to be postmaster at Priest River, Idaho, in place of W. P. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1930.

ILLINOIS

Edgar H. Chadwick to be postmaster at Ashton, Ill., in place of E. H. Chadwick. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

William Ryder to be postmaster at Auburn, Ill., in place of William Ryder. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Herman Semmelroth to be postmaster at Belleville, Ill., in place of Herman Semmelroth. Incumbent's commission expires December 22, 1930.

William Kitts, jr., to be postmaster at Bellflower, Ill., in place of William Kitts, jr. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

Leonard J. Obery to be postmaster at Chestnut, Ill., in place of L. J. Obery. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

Henry C. Voegtli to be postmaster at Collinsville, Ill., in place of W. K. Lepp, resigned.

Earl D. Husted to be postmaster at Cornell, Ill., in place of E. D. Husted. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

Louis R. Kelly to be postmaster at Duquoin, Ill., in place of L. R. Kelly. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

William W. Austin to be postmaster at Effingham, Ill., in place of W. W. Austin. Incumbent's commission expired June 16, 1930.

Herbert W. Greene to be postmaster at Fairbury, Ill., in place of A. K. Hirstein, removed.

Frank G. Doney to be postmaster at Fithian, Ill., in place of F. G. Doney. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

George V. Robinson to be postmaster at Forrest, Ill., in place of G. V. Robinson. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1930.

Mary F. Robbins to be postmaster at Glenwood, Ill., in place of M. F. Robbins. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

Walter A. Leigh to be postmaster at Jerseyville, Ill., in place of W. A. Leigh. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Fuller Green to be postmaster at Kenney, Ill., in place of Fuller Green. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

Orlando H. Akin to be postmaster at Kirkwood, Ill., in place of O. H. Akin. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Thomas W. Collins to be postmaster at Knoxville, Ill., in place of T. W. Collins. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

Walter C. Howe to be postmaster at Latham, Ill., in place of W. C. Howe. Incumbent's commission expires December 22, 1930.

Harvey T. Smith to be postmaster at Mendon, Ill., in place of J. B. Frisbie, deceased.

Virgil G. Beauchamp to be postmaster at Meredosia, Ill., in place of V. G. Beauchamp. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

Lester Cromwell to be postmaster at Momence, Ill., in place of Lester Cromwell. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

Laura B. Hayes to be postmaster at Monroe Center, Ill., in place of L. B. Hayes. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

Benjamin A. Kent to be postmaster at Morrisonville, Ill., in place of B. A. Kent. Incumbent's commission expires December 22, 1930.

Franklin S. Lyman to be postmaster at Oak Forest, Ill., in place of F. S. Lyman. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Rue L. Witham to be postmaster at Perry, Ill., in place of A. M. Reineke. Incumbent's commission expired July 3, 1930.

Albert Weiland to be postmaster at Peru, Ill., in place of Albert Weiland. Incumbent's commission expires December 22, 1930.

William C. Roodhouse to be postmaster at Roodhouse, Ill., in place of W. C. Roodhouse. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Viola M. Rowland to be postmaster at Rutland, Ill., in place of V. M. Rowland. Incumbent's commission expires December 22, 1930.

Daniel B. Comegys to be postmaster at Seneca, Ill., in place of D. B. Comegys. Incumbent's commission expires December 22, 1930.

Thomas A. Brown to be postmaster at Sparta, Ill., in place of T. A. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Frances E. Tinker to be postmaster at Stonington, Ill., in place of F. E. Tinker. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Abraham L. Houk to be postmaster at Tuscola, Ill., in place of A. L. Houk. Incumbent's commission expires December 22, 1930.

Robert E. Laycock to be postmaster at Ursa, Ill., in place of Priscilla Crandal, resigned.

Edwin G. Meyer to be postmaster at Valmeyer, Ill., in place of E. G. Meyer. Incumbent's commission expires December 22, 1930.

Luella H. McCoid to be postmaster at Venice, Ill., in place of L. H. McCoid. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

Joseph E. Shantz to be postmaster at Wilmette, Ill., in place of J. E. Shantz. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

INDIANA

Charles A. Gatwood to be postmaster at Albion, Ind., in place of C. A. Gatwood. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Pearle Coffin to be postmaster at Carthage, Ind., in place of Pearle Coffin. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

McKinley Ayer to be postmaster at Chrisney, Ind., in place of McKinley Ayer. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1929.

John Walker to be postmaster at Fortville, Ind., in place of G. H. Thomas, resigned.

John B. Fornwald to be postmaster at Gaston Ind., in place of J. B. Fornwald. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1930.

Albert Neuenschwander to be postmaster at Grabill, Ind., in place of Albert Neuenschwander. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1930.

William B. Thornley to be postmaster at Jeffersonville, Ind., in place of W. B. Thornley. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1930.

Phineas O. Small to be postmaster at La Porte, Ind., in place of P. O. Small. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

Nell Manley to be postmaster at Laurel, Ind., in place of Nell Manley. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1930.

William S. Milner to be postmaster at Ligonier, Ind., in place of W. S. Milner. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1930.

David R. Scott to be postmaster at Linton, Ind., in place of H. O. Hart, deceased.

Floyd E. Leonard to be postmaster at Mulberry, Ind., in place of F. E. Leonard. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Sam J. Bufkin to be postmaster at Newcastle, Ind., in place of S. J. Bufkin. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1930.

George E. Young to be postmaster at Shelbyville, Ind., in place of G. E. Young. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1930.

IOWA

Carl G. Anderson to be postmaster at Arthur, Iowa, in place of C. G. Anderson. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1930.

Carl E. Meek to be postmaster at Bonaparte, Iowa, in place of C. E. Meek. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1930.

Arden W. Keeney to be postmaster at Carlisle, Iowa, in place of A. W. Keeney. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1930.

H. Asa Jones to be postmaster at Charter Oak, Iowa, in place of E. F. Glau. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1930.

Arthur Ingraham to be postmaster at Conesville, Iowa, in place of Arthur Ingraham. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1930.

Gilbert R. West to be postmaster at Corydon, Iowa, in place of G. R. West. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1930.

George C. Lloyd to be postmaster at Dallas Center, Iowa, in place of G. C. Lloyd. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1930.

William W. Andrew to be postmaster at Dexter, Iowa, in place of W. W. Andrew. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

Rhea Sowers to be postmaster at Henderson, Iowa, in place of F. H. Casebolt. Incumbent's commission expired July 2, 1930.

George W. Kennedy to be postmaster at Montrose, Iowa, in place of G. W. Kennedy. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1930.

Charles S. Walling to be postmaster at Oskaloosa, Iowa, in place of C. S. Walling. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1930.

Homer A. Roth to be postmaster at Ottumwa, Iowa, in place of H. A. Roth. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1930.

Frank M. Hood to be postmaster at Sergeant Bluff, Iowa, in place of F. M. Hood. Incumbent's commission expired July 2, 1930.

Anna M. Beck to be postmaster at Solon, Iowa, in place of A. M. Beck. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1930.

Cecil E. Wherry to be postmaster at Wyoming, Iowa, in place of C. E. Wherry. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1930.

David L. Rundberg to be postmaster at Yale, Iowa, in place of P. W. Hummel, resigned.

KANSAS

Anna B. Jennings to be postmaster at Arnold, Kans. Made presidential July 1, 1930.

Wilbur B. Morris to be postmaster at Eldorado, Kans., in place of W. B. Morris. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Harriet P. Lowell to be postmaster at Fall River, Kans., in place of H. P. Lowell. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Harry W. Mudge to be postmaster at Gridley, Kans., in place of H. W. Mudge. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Maude P. Evans to be postmaster at Hartford, Kans., in place of M. P. Evans. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Wiley Caves to be postmaster to Inman, Kans., in place of Wiley Caves. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1930.

Theodore H. Rinne to be postmaster at Kinsley, Kans., in place of A. F. Aderhold. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

Roy C. Mortimer to be postmaster at McCracken, Kans., in place of R. C. Mortimer. Incumbent's commission expires December 20, 1930.

John F. Oliver to be postmaster at Oxford, Kans., in place of J. F. Oliver. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1930.

Gertrude H. Nuttmann to be postmaster at Paxico, Kans., in place of J. F. Nuttmann, deceased.

Ella J. Starr to be postmaster at Scott City, Kans., in place of E. J. Starr. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1930.

Bessie W. Brennan to be postmaster at Strong, Kans., in place of B. W. Brennan. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1930.

Caroline Boman to be postmaster at Virgil, Kans., in place of Caroline Boman. Incumbent's commission expires December 20, 1930.

Henry N. Jessen to be postmaster at White Water, Kans., in place of H. N. Jessen. Incumbent's commission expires December 20, 1930.

KENTUCKY

Hobart Ison to be postmaster at Blackey, Ky., in place of Hobart Ison. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

Mike C. Winfrey to be postmaster at Columbia, Ky., in place of M. C. Winfrey. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1930.

William H. Sergent to be postmaster at Jenkins, Ky., in place of W. H. Sergent. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1930.

Willis D. McCammish to be postmaster at Versailles, Ky., in place of U. G. Willis, resigned.

LOUISIANA

Marcie M. Rogers to be postmaster at Baldwin, La., in place of L. A. Shaw, removed.

David Dunn to be postmaster at Columbia, La., in place of David Dunn. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Kate P. McDonnell to be postmaster at Pelican, La., in place of K. P. McDonnell. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Jesse R. Ramsey to be postmaster at Pleasant Hill, La., in place of J. R. Ramsey. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

Beckie D. Bradford to be postmaster at Tullos, La., in place of B. D. Bradford. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

MAINE

Cleo A. Russell to be postmaster at Bethel, Me., in place of C. A. Russell. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Ray Winchenpaw to be postmaster at Friendship, Me., in place of Ray Winchenpaw. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Frank E. Hoyt to be postmaster at Gorham, Me., in place of F. E. Hoyt. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1930.

George W. Hopkins to be postmaster at Howland, Me., in place of G. W. Hopkins. Incumbent's commission expired June 8, 1930.

Ellsworth W. Sawyer to be postmaster at Kezar Falls, Me., in place of E. W. Sawyer. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Luther C. Spiller to be postmaster at Mechanic Falls, Me., in place of L. C. Spiller. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1930.

Leonard O. Meader to be postmaster at North Berwick, Me., in place of L. O. Meader. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Velorus T. Shaw to be postmaster at Prouts Neck, Me., in place of V. T. Shaw. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1930.

Harry N. Ferguson to be postmaster at Sanford, Me., in place of H. N. Ferguson. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Joe P. Davis to be postmaster at South Berwick, Me., in place of J. P. Davis. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Thomas R. McPhail to be postmaster at Thomaston, Me., in place of T. R. McPhail. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

William C. Flint to be postmaster at Waldoboro, Me., in place of W. C. Flint. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

MARYLAND

LeRoy T. Mankin to be postmaster at Fort George G. Meade, Md., in place of L. T. Mankin. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1930.

Arthur S. Calhoun to be postmaster at Parkton, Md., in place of A. S. Calhoun. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1930.

William H. Condiff to be postmaster at Solomons, Md., in place of W. H. Condiff. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1930.

Thomas H. Lytle to be postmaster at White Hall, Md., in place of J. F. Wiley. Incumbent's commission expired May 21, 1930.

MASSACHUSETTS

Henry L. Pierce to be postmaster at Barre, Mass., in place of H. L. Pierce. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

Almon L. Pratt to be postmaster at Belchertown, Mass., in place of A. L. Pratt. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

Alfred A. Averill to be postmaster at Edgartown, Mass., in place of A. A. Averill. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

Clarence E. Arnold to be postmaster at Hopedale, Mass., in place of C. E. Arnold. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

Louise S. Snow to be postmaster at Middleton, Mass., in place of L. S. Snow. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

Nathaniel E. Lewis to be postmaster at Provincetown, Mass., in place of N. E. Lewis. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

Edgar S. Woodman to be postmaster at West Medway, Mass., in place of E. S. Woodman. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

Samuel Highley to be postmaster at Woburn, Mass., in place of Samuel Highley. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1929.

MICHIGAN

Leroy M. Gunniss to be postmaster at Algonac, Mich., in place of L. M. Gunniss. Incumbent's commission expires January 14, 1931.

Marie L. Mottes to be postmaster at Alpha, Mich., in place of M. L. Mottes. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

Ernest E. Hawes to be postmaster at Applegate, Mich., in place of E. E. Hawes. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

Charles F. Waldie to be postmaster at Bancroft, Mich., in place of C. F. Waldie. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Henry E. Cowdin to be postmaster at Carson City, Mich., in place of H. E. Cowdin. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

John M. Eusebio to be postmaster at Caspian, Mich., in place of E. J. Crete, removed.

Samuel C. Kirkbride to be postmaster at Clare, Mich., in place of S. C. Kirkbride. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

Charles M. Vermilya to be postmaster at Columbiaville, Mich., in place of C. M. Vermilya. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

Asa B. Freeman to be postmaster at Durand, Mich., in place of A. B. Freeman. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Otto C. Miller to be postmaster at East Detroit, Mich., in place of O. C. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

Louis Gee to be postmaster at Farwell, Mich., in place of Louis Gee. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Ernest E. Yerdon to be postmaster at Fenton, Mich., in place of E. E. Yerdon. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Flora Van Zinderen to be postmaster at Grandville, Mich., in place of Flora Van Zinderen. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

Henry I. Walker to be postmaster at Greenville, Mich., in place of H. I. Walker. Incumbent's commission expires December 22, 1930.

Edna Donohue to be postmaster at Gregory, Mich., in place of Edna Donohue. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Ethel P. Colwell to be postmaster at Harrisville, Mich., in place of E. P. Colwell. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

Fred B. Kay to be postmaster at Lapeer, Mich., in place of F. B. Kay. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

George H. Steadman to be postmaster at Lyons, Mich., in place of G. H. Steadman. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

John P. Robertson to be postmaster at Metamora, Mich., in place of J. P. Robertson. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

Charles J. Kappler to be postmaster at Port Austin, Mich., in place of C. J. Kappler. Incumbent's commission expires January 18, 1931.

Thomas S. Scupholm to be postmaster at Port Huron, Mich., in place of T. S. Scupholm. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

John B. Hecox to be postmaster at Portland, Mich., in place of C. T. Lockwood, resigned.

Frank L. Brighenti to be postmaster at Ramsay, Mich., in place of M. A. Bami, resigned.

Charles H. Dodge to be postmaster at Romeo, Mich., in place of C. H. Dodge. Incumbent's commission expires January 18, 1931.

Menno C. Weber to be postmaster at Saranac, Mich., in place of M. C. Weber. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

Bert Green to be postmaster at Shepherd, Mich., in place of Bert Green. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

James V. Baker to be postmaster at South Lyon, Mich., in place of J. V. Baker. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

George Q. Brace to be postmaster at Sparta, Mich., in place of G. Q. Brace. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Oscar W. Greenlund to be postmaster at Stambaugh, Mich., in place of O. W. Greenlund. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

Frank P. Church to be postmaster at Stanton, Mich., in place of F. P. Church. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

David F. Jones to be postmaster at Unionville, Mich., in place of D. F. Jones. Incumbent's commission expires January 29, 1931.

Enoch J. Andrus to be postmaster at Utica, Mich., in place of E. J. Andrus. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Christopher J. Bristow to be postmaster at Van Dyke, Mich., in place of C. J. Bristow. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

James M. Carr to be postmaster at Vassar, Mich., in place of J. M. Carr. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

Bea Kelly to be postmaster at Watersmeet, Mich., in place of J. L. Kelly, resigned.

MINNESOTA

Stanley E. Nelson to be postmaster at Adrian, Minn., in place of S. E. Nelson. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

Edward R. Bell to be postmaster at Akeley, Minn., in place of E. R. Bell. Incumbent's commission expires December 22, 1930.

John O. Gullander to be postmaster at Belgrade, Minn., in place of J. O. Gullander. Incumbent's commission expires December 22, 1930.

Olney A. Solberg to be postmaster at Brooten, Minn., in place of O. A. Solberg. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1930.

Mathias N. Koll to be postmaster at Cass Lake, Minn., in place of N. W. Christensen, resigned.

Michael Hollaren to be postmaster at Ellsworth, Minn., in place of Michael Hollaren. Incumbent's commission expired March 11, 1930.

Claude W. Tucker to be postmaster at Fort Ripley, Minn., in place of C. W. Tucker. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1930.

Clyde H. Hiatt to be postmaster at Granada, Minn., in place of C. H. Hiatt. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1930.

Carl J. Johnson to be postmaster at Hendricks, Minn., in place of C. J. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1930.

Herman E. Kent to be postmaster at Sanborn, Minn., in place of H. E. Kent. Incumbent's commission expires December 22, 1930.

Arnold J. Bauer to be postmaster at Wabasso, Minn., in place of Joseph Groebner. Incumbent's commission expired March 11, 1930.

MISSISSIPPI

Matthew T. Patton to be postmaster at Alcorn, Miss., in place of M. T. Patton. Incumbent's commission expired July 2, 1930.

John R. Meunier to be postmaster at Biloxi, Miss., in place of J. R. Meunier. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1930.

Hugh A. Sasser to be postmaster at Bogue Chitto, Miss., in place of H. A. Sasser. Incumbent's commission expired July 2, 1930.

William C. Bailey to be postmaster at Como, Miss., in place of A. M. Patterson. Incumbent's commission expired July 2, 1930.

Mary A. Joyner to be postmaster at Houlika, Miss., in place of I. N. Joyner, deceased.

Roy Scott to be postmaster at Lake Cormorant, Miss., in place of N. M. Scott. Incumbent's commission expired March 11, 1930.

Charles C. Swetman to be postmaster at Perkinston, Miss., in place of C. C. Swetman. Incumbent's commission expired June 7, 1930.

Henry P. Patton to be postmaster at Sardis, Miss., in place of H. P. Patton. Incumbent's commission expired April 13, 1930.

Bill J. Martin to be postmaster at Vosburg, Miss., in place of A. N. Utsey. Incumbent's commission expired February 17, 1929.

MISSOURI

William O. Roberts to be postmaster at Doniphan, Mo., in place of J. J. Kennon, deceased.

Edward A. Hackmann to be postmaster at Fayette, Mo., in place of A. B. Cloud. Incumbent's commission expired December 22, 1929.

Charles E. Bedell to be postmaster at Hale, Mo., in place of C. E. Bedell. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1930.

MONTANA

Pontus C. Haegg to be postmaster at Charlo, Mont. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

John B. Randall to be postmaster at Wolf Point, Mont., in place of J. B. Randall. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

NEBRASKA

Clarence L. Snyder to be postmaster at Bushnell, Nebr., in place of C. L. Snyder. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

William J. Allen to be postmaster at Fort Robinson, Nebr. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Orpha A. McCray to be postmaster at Merriman, Nebr., in place of Charles McCray, deceased.

Edward E. Ely to be postmaster at Milford, Nebr., in place of E. E. Ely. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

Margaret E. Gleason to be postmaster at Platte Center, Nebr., in place of M. M. Gleason, resigned.

NEVADA

Mabel L. Andrews to be postmaster at Hawthorne, Nev. Office became presidential July 1, 1929.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Willard G. Holt to be postmaster at Epping, N. H., in place of W. G. Holt. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

NEW JERSEY

Clara C. Hurry to be postmaster at Atco, N. J., in place of C. C. Hurry. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1930.

J. Ernest Spencer to be postmaster at Beachhaven, N. J., in place of J. A. Beer, resigned.

Forman R. Thompson to be postmaster at Matawan, N. J., in place of F. R. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

William D. Dolbeer to be postmaster at Millburn, N. J., in place of G. C. Kessler, deceased.

Frank J. Bock to be postmaster at Newark, N. J., in place of F. J. Bock. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1929.

J. Reeves Hildreth to be postmaster at Ocean City, N. J., in place of E. A. Corson, deceased.

William S. Dey to be postmaster at South Amboy, N. J., in place of Robert Chapman, resigned.

Charles H. Updike to be postmaster at Trenton, N. J., in place of C. H. Updike. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

NEW YORK

Pearla S. Kling to be postmaster at Albany, N. Y., in place of P. S. Kling. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

Ernest R. Netzen to be postmaster at Alexander, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

George I. Yost to be postmaster at Ballston Spa, N. Y., in place of G. I. Yost. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

Jennie E. Carroll to be postmaster at Cuylerville, N. Y., in place of J. E. Carroll. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

Karl L. Whipple to be postmaster at Dannemora, N. Y., in place of L. H. Buck, resigned.

Frederick A. Lowe to be postmaster at Fayetteville, N. Y., in place of H. J. Goodfellow. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1930.

I. Wallace Fish to be postmaster at Frankfort, N. Y., in place of R. J. Fuller, deceased.

Henry C. Almy to be postmaster at Friendship, N. Y., in place of H. C. Almy. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

Thomas W. Hamer to be postmaster at Lacona, N. Y., in place of T. W. Hamer. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

Henry T. Kenyon to be postmaster at Leonardsville, N. Y., in place of H. T. Kenyon. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

William H. Ordway to be postmaster at Mount McGregor, N. Y., in place of W. H. Ordway. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

William V. Wagner to be postmaster at Nanuet, N. Y., in place of G. M. Edsall, resigned.

Edmund E. Westerman to be postmaster at Pittsford, N. Y., in place of E. E. Westerman. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

Robert Lester to be postmaster at Richland, N. Y., in place of W. D. Streeter, deceased.

George E. Clark to be postmaster at Romulus, N. Y., in place of G. E. Clark. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

William P. Andres to be postmaster at Round Lake, N. Y., in place of Elizabeth May. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1930.

Rollin G. Giffin to be postmaster at St. Regis Falls, N. Y., in place of E. E. Bandy. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1930.

Helen L. Wilcox to be postmaster at Shelter Island Heights, N. Y., in place of H. L. Wilcox. Incumbent's commission expired January 29, 1930.

Caroline A. R. Roberson to be postmaster at Shushan, N. Y., in place of Frank Dobbin, resigned.

August P. Lenz to be postmaster at Thendara, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

William C. Raynor to be postmaster at West Hampton, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Frank E. Everest to be postmaster at Wilmington, N. Y. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

NORTH CAROLINA

Jack M. Sentelle to be postmaster at Clyde, N. C., in place of J. W. Shook. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1930.

Luadan V. Rhyne to be postmaster at Dallas, N. C., in place of L. V. Rhyne. Incumbent's commission expired April 14, 1930.

Halbert A. Thompson to be postmaster at Fairmont, N. C., in place of J. D. Andrews. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1930.

George T. Whitaker to be postmaster at Franklinton, N. C., in place of G. T. Whitaker. Incumbent's commission expired April 13, 1930.

Cadmus P. Wright to be postmaster at Henderson, N. C., in place of V. W. Faris, resigned.

James F. Setzer to be postmaster at Hickory, N. C., in place of H. H. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired March 23, 1930.

Herman A. Merrell to be postmaster at Leicester, N. C. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Christopher H. Mattocks to be postmaster at Maysville, N. C., in place of C. H. Mattocks. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1930.

Mary E. Ross to be postmaster at New London, N. C. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Charles A. Bland to be postmaster at Wadesboro, N. C., in place of C. A. Bland. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Wiley B. Knowles to be postmaster at Wallace, N. C., in place of W. B. Knowles. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

Fred T. Tucker to be postmaster at Wilmington, N. C., in place of W. G. Elliott, deceased.

NORTH DAKOTA

Ruth Y. Hardy to be postmaster at Burnstad, N. Dak. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Daisy Thompson to be postmaster at Carpio, N. Dak., in place of Daisy Thompson. Incumbent's commission expired January 5, 1930.

Jacob Krier to be postmaster at Gladstone, N. Dak., in place of Jacob Krier. Incumbent's commission expired June 21, 1930.

Carl C. Harr to be postmaster at Martin, N. Dak., in place of C. C. Harr. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1930.

Elvin J. Elstad to be postmaster at Rugby, N. Dak., in place of E. J. Elstad. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1930.

Thomas H. Tharalson to be postmaster at San Haven, N. Dak. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

OHIO

Berman K. Smith to be postmaster at Arcanum, Ohio, in place of B. K. Smith. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1930.

Charles E. McClelland to be postmaster at Attica, Ohio, in place of C. E. McClelland. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1930.

William Compton, jr., to be postmaster at Blacklick, Ohio. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

J. Schuyler Hossler to be postmaster at Bloomville, Ohio, in place of J. S. Hossler. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1930.

Faith H. Malsbary to be postmaster at Blue Ash, Ohio. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

James U. Riley to be postmaster at Brookville, Ohio, in place of J. U. Riley. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1930.

Clarence E. McCafferty to be postmaster at Chauncey, Ohio. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Fred S. McCoy to be postmaster at Fairlawn, Ohio. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Albert W. Griswold to be postmaster at Georgetown, Ohio, in place of A. W. Griswold. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

George R. Warren to be postmaster at Groveport, Ohio, in place of G. R. Warren. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1930.

Arthur H. Wood to be postmaster at Holland, Ohio. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

George M. Jenkins to be postmaster at Huron, Ohio, in place of E. E. Cook, deceased.

Charles S. Case to be postmaster at Jefferson, Ohio, in place of C. S. Case. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1930.

Fred G. Bates to be postmaster at Madison, Ohio, in place of F. G. Bates. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1930.

Leo Mutach to be postmaster at Marblehead, Ohio, in place of Leo Mutach. Incumbent's commission expired May 28, 1930.

Benjamin F. Duell to be postmaster at Mogadore, Ohio, in place of K. S. Bauer, resigned.

Alice M. O'Meara to be postmaster at Mount St. Joseph, Ohio, in place of M. A. McCann. Incumbent's commission expired July 2, 1930.

Earl C. Mikesell to be postmaster at New Paris, Ohio, in place of E. C. Mikesell. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1930.

Kensel L. Birkhead to be postmaster at Orient, Ohio. Office became presidential July 1, 1929.

Frank P. Johnson to be postmaster at Pataskala, Ohio, in place of F. P. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1930.

Florence R. Smith to be postmaster at Pomeroy, Ohio, in place of F. R. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1930.

William Schnoor to be postmaster at Put in Bay, Ohio, in place of William Schnoor. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1929.

Raymond J. Rowley to be postmaster at Quincy, Ohio, in place of N. P. Swank. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1929.

Harlan B. Miller to be postmaster at Shiloh, Ohio, in place of H. B. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1930.

Dwight D. Fierbaugh to be postmaster at South Euclid, Ohio, in place of D. D. Fierbaugh. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1930.

Chester W. Holt to be postmaster at Stow, Ohio. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Bert E. Woodward to be postmaster at Stryker, Ohio, in place of B. E. Woodward. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1930.

Charles A. Alexander to be postmaster at Vanburen, Ohio. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Estella Wilson to be postmaster at Warsaw, Ohio, in place of Estella Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1930.

William Disher to be postmaster at Waterville, Ohio, in place of G. W. Hurless. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1930.

Josiah T. Gibson to be postmaster at Waverly, Ohio, in place of J. T. Gibson. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1930.

Ross H. Hartsock to be postmaster at Waynesville, Ohio, in place of R. H. Hartsock. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1930.

Alice C. Griffith to be postmaster at Worthington, Ohio, in place of A. C. Griffith. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

OKLAHOMA

Fred G. Marsh to be postmaster at Afton, Okla., in place of C. M. Hudspeth. Incumbent's commission expired July 2, 1930.

Mable C. Heidenreich to be postmaster at Duke, Okla., in place of M. C. Heidenreich. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1930.

Edwin B. Minich to be postmaster at Eldorado, Okla., in place of E. B. Minich. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1930.

Wayne Anderson to be postmaster at Miami, Okla., in place of L. B. McWilliams, resigned.

Vernon Whiting to be postmaster at Pawhuska, Okla., in place of Vernon Whiting. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1930.

James L. Hines to be postmaster at Reydon, Okla. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

David W. Robinson to be postmaster at Talihina, Okla., in place of D. W. Robinson. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1930.

Mary Moore to be postmaster at Valliant, Okla., in place of Judge Griffin, removed.

Porter Z. Newman to be postmaster at Welch, Okla., in place of P. Z. Newman. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1930.

OREGON

Joel C. Sturgill to be postmaster at Baker, Oreg., in place of W. S. Bowers, deceased.

Albert R. Barnes to be postmaster at Kinzua, Oreg. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

John A. McCall to be postmaster at Klamath Falls, Oreg., in place of J. A. McCall. Incumbent's commission expired April 14, 1930.

Teresa H. McComb to be postmaster at Malin, Oreg., in place of T. H. McComb. Incumbent's commission expired July 2, 1930.

John S. Hudson to be postmaster at Troutdale, Oreg., in place of J. S. Hudson. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

PENNSYLVANIA

Charles H. Truby to be postmaster at Apollo, Pa., in place of C. H. Truby. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1929.

Lemuel A. Bosserman to be postmaster at Barnesboro, Pa., in place of L. A. Bosserman. Incumbent's commission expired April 2, 1930.

William J. Wilson to be postmaster at Bentleyville, Pa., in place of W. J. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expires December 22, 1930.

George Wetmiller to be postmaster at Berlin, Pa., in place of George Wetmiller. Incumbent's commission expired June 8, 1930.

Hilda A. Lago to be postmaster at Bessemer, Pa., in place of H. A. Lago. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

Arthur R. Lovell to be postmaster at Blandburg, Pa., in place of A. R. Lovell. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

Emma J. Coleman to be postmaster at Braeburn, Pa., in place of E. J. Coleman. Incumbent's commission expired July 2, 1930.

Lewis C. Mensch to be postmaster at Catawissa, Pa., in place of J. R. Diemer, deceased.

Joseph E. Lohr to be postmaster at Central City, Pa., in place of J. E. Lohr. Incumbent's commission expired January 25, 1930.

Clayton S. Bell to be postmaster at Chicora, Pa., in place of C. S. Bell. Incumbent's commission expired May 26, 1930.

J. Henry Gibson to be postmaster at Conneautville, Pa., in place of J. H. Gibson. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

Thomas E. Sheridan to be postmaster at Curwensville, Pa., in place of H. S. Crownover. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1930.

Vera Ritchey to be postmaster at Dunlo, Pa., in place of Vera Ritchey. Incumbent's commission expired April 5, 1930.

William E. Reed to be postmaster at Duquesne, Pa., in place of W. E. Reed. Incumbent's commission expires December 22, 1930.

George D. Kinkead to be postmaster at Ebensburg, Pa., in place of G. D. Kinkead. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1930.

George H. Cole to be postmaster at Evans City, Pa., in place of G. H. Cole. Incumbent's commission expired June 22, 1930.

Alexander Hamilton to be postmaster at Export, Pa., in place of Alexander Hamilton. Incumbent's commission expires December 22, 1930.

William H. Weston to be postmaster at Gallitzin, Pa., in place of W. H. Weston. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1930.

Emma M. Schrock to be postmaster at Garrett, Pa., in place of E. M. Schrock. Incumbent's commission expires December 20, 1930.

Harry L. Warnick to be postmaster at Glen Riddle, Pa., in place of H. L. Warnick. Incumbent's commission expired March 11, 1930.

Edward S. Lawrence to be postmaster at Graterford, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Kenneth B. Barnes to be postmaster at Harrisville, Pa., in place of W. K. Speer. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1930.

Wilson R. Kulp to be postmaster at Hatfield, Pa., in place of W. R. Kulp. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1930.

Aleda U. Shumaker to be postmaster at Jerome, Pa., in place of Z. S. Truax, resigned.

Mae Van Buskirk to be postmaster at Kinzua, Pa., in place of Mae Van Buskirk. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1930.

William H. Lowry to be postmaster at Ligonier, Pa., in place of W. H. Lowry. Incumbent's commission expires December 22, 1930.

Thomas B. Conrad to be postmaster at Lilly, Pa., in place of T. B. Conrad. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1930.

Harold D. Lowing to be postmaster at Linesville, Pa., in place of H. D. Lowing. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

Tillie Bradley to be postmaster at Loretto, Pa., in place of Tillie Bradley. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1929.

Edward F. Poist to be postmaster at McSherrystown, Pa., in place of E. F. Poist. Incumbent's commission expired March 11, 1930.

Arch R. Lykens to be postmaster at Martinsburg, Pa., in place of A. R. Lykens. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

Thomas V. Diffendafer to be postmaster at Millerstown, Pa., in place of T. V. Diffendafer. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1930.

Thomas H. Kelly to be postmaster at Moores, Pa., in place of T. H. Kelly. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1930.

Mary M. Davis to be postmaster at Mount Morris, Pa., in place of M. M. Davis. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

J. Bertram Nesper to be postmaster at Narberth, Pa., in place of J. B. Nesper. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1930.

Elma C. Dryden to be postmaster at New Galilee, Pa., in place of E. C. Dryden. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

Mary G. Campbell to be postmaster at Nottingham, Pa., in place of M. G. Campbell. Incumbent's commission expires December 16, 1930.

Homer T. Wear to be postmaster at Orbisonia, Pa., in place of Frank Heidel, removed.

Thomas Powell to be postmaster at Patton, Pa., in place of Thomas Powell. Incumbent's commission expired April 2, 1930.

Samuel E. Crawford to be postmaster at Petrolia, Pa., in place of S. E. Crawford. Incumbent's commission expired July 2, 1930.

Edward Bayley to be postmaster at Picture Rocks, Pa., in place of Edward Bayley. Incumbent's commission expires December 20, 1930.

Smith M. McCreight to be postmaster at Reynoldsville, Pa., in place of S. M. McCreight. Incumbent's commission expires December 22, 1930.

John E. Pennel to be postmaster at Rydal, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1930.

Jennie W. McFarland to be postmaster at Sagamore, Pa., in place of J. W. McFarland. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

Jean McPherson to be postmaster at St. Benedict, Pa., in place of Jean McPherson. Incumbent's commission expired January 6, 1930.

Otto W. Petry to be postmaster at Salisbury, Pa., in place of O. W. Petry. Incumbent's commission expired June 8, 1930.

Lucille T. Packer to be postmaster at Skytop, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Hulda J. McCormick to be postmaster at South Connells-ville, Pa., in place of H. J. McCormick. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

Zola K. Rodkey to be postmaster at Spangler, Pa., in place of Z. K. Rodkey. Incumbent's commission expired June 10, 1930.

Harvey E. Rogers to be postmaster at Spring City, Pa., in place of H. E. Rogers. Incumbent's commission expires December 22, 1930.

Annie O. Sandt to be postmaster at Stockertown, Pa. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Vincent S. Pownall to be postmaster at Swarthmore, Pa., in place of V. S. Pownall. Incumbent's commission expired July 3, 1930.

Charles H. Potter to be postmaster at Titusville, Pa., in place of C. H. Potter. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

Alvin O. Sieg to be postmaster at Tobyhanna, Pa., in place of A. S. Boening. Incumbent's commission expired May 5, 1930.

Dean R. Clifford to be postmaster at Trafford, Pa., in place of D. R. Clifford. Incumbent's commission expires December 22, 1930.

William D. Ghrist to be postmaster at Uniontown, Pa., in place of W. D. Ghrist. Incumbent's commission expired June 3, 1930.

John F. Dougherty to be postmaster at Villanova, Pa., in place of J. C. Gleason, resigned.

George F. Eisenhower to be postmaster at West Lawn, Pa., in place of A. M. Eisenhower. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1930.

PORTO RICO

Juan Aparicio Rivera to be postmaster at Adjuntas, P. R., in place of J. A. Rivera. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1929.

Concepcion Torrens de Arrillaga to be postmaster at Anasco, P. R., in place of C. T. de Arrillaga. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1929.

Alfredo Gimenez y Moreno to be postmaster at Bayamon, P. R., in place of A. G. y Moreno. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1929.

Alfredo F. Irizarry to be postmaster at Cabo Rojo, P. R., in place of A. F. Irizarry. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1929.

Julio Ramos to be postmaster at Cayey, P. R., in place of Julio Ramos. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1929.

Angel de Jesus Matos to be postmaster at Coamo, P. R., in place of Angel de Jesus Matos. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1929.

Jose Carrera to be postmaster at Humacao, P. R., in place of Jose Carrera. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1930.

Eduvigis de la Rosa to be postmaster at Isabela, P. R., in place of Eduvigis de la Rosa. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1929.

Angel F. Colon to be postmaster at Juana Diaz, P. R., in place of A. F. Colon. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1929.

Pedro Muniz Rivera to be postmaster at Manati, P. R., in place of P. M. Rivera. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1930.

Luis Clos to be postmaster at Naguabo, P. R., in place of Luis Clos. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1929.

Antonio Godinez to be postmaster at Rio Piedras, P. R., in place of Antonio Godinez. Incumbent's commission expired December 11, 1930.

Augusto M. Garcia to be postmaster at Sabana Grande, P. R., in place of A. M. Garcia. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1929.

Hortensia R. O'Neill to be postmaster at San German, P. R., in place of H. R. O'Neill. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1929.

Francisco Valldejuli to be postmaster at Yabucoa, P. R., in place of Francisco Valldejuli. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1929.

Simon Semidei to be postmaster at Yauco, P. R., in place of Simon Semidei. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1929.

SOUTH CAROLINA

William R. Rozier to be postmaster at Bethune, S. C., in place of W. R. Rozier. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1929.

Conway Dial to be postmaster at Cross Hill, S. C., in place of J. W. Hanna. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1930.

Adam C. Dayson to be postmaster at Johns Island, S. C., in place of A. C. Dayson. Incumbent's commission expired December 10, 1930.

Deans Crumpler to be postmaster at Latta, S. C., in place of Deans Crumpler. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1930.

George S. McCravey to be postmaster at Liberty, S. C., in place of G. S. McCravey. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Junius S. Bagnol to be postmaster at Manning, S. C., in place of Cary Smith. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1930.

John G. Fowler to be postmaster at New Brookland, S. C., in place of E. W. Shull. Incumbent's commission expired January 26, 1930.

William D. Sutton to be postmaster at Pageland, S. C., in place of W. D. Sutton. Incumbent's commission expired December 14, 1930.

Crayton C. Crenshaw to be postmaster at Pendleton, S. C., in place of J. C. Blair, resigned.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Floyd V. Stephens to be postmaster at Canova, S. Dak., in place of F. V. Stephens. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1930.

Arthur M. Hanson to be postmaster at Iroquois, S. Dak., in place of A. M. Hanson. Incumbent's commission expired July 2, 1930.

Robert C. Van Horn to be postmaster at Kennebec, S. Dak., in place of R. C. Van Horn. Incumbent's commission expired March 29, 1930.

Elmer N. Rasmussen to be postmaster at Onaka, S. Dak. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Reynold H. Peterson to be postmaster at Pollock, S. Dak., in place of R. H. Peterson. Incumbent's commission expires December 17, 1930.

Daisy B. Chamberlain to be postmaster at Quinn, S. Dak., in place of O. N. Hunt. Incumbent's commission expired December 21, 1929.

Lydia H. Johnson to be postmaster at Sanator, S. Dak., in place of R. H. McCullagh, resigned.

Harry D. Crosmer to be postmaster at Scenic, S. Dak. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Eloise Holdren to be postmaster at Vale, S. Dak. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Archibald B. Elliott to be postmaster at Valley Springs, S. Dak., in place of J. D. Hansen, removed.

Charles E. Sheldon to be postmaster at Watauga, S. Dak. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Merrill Kaufman to be postmaster at Wood, S. Dak. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

TENNESSEE

Homer C. Eastland to be postmaster at Collinwood, Tenn. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

John M. Thompson to be postmaster at Englewood, Tenn., in place of J. M. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1930.

Jasper D. Wright to be postmaster at Jamestown, Tenn., in place of J. D. Wright. Incumbent's commission expired April 2, 1930.

Alfred F. Agee to be postmaster at LaFollette, Tenn., in place of A. F. Agee. Incumbent's commission expires December 20, 1930.

Tyson T. Cole to be postmaster at Minor Hill, Tenn. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

George Wilcox to be postmaster at Monterey, Tenn., in place of J. N. Clouse, resigned.

TEXAS

Willis A. Wilson to be postmaster at Ackerly, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

John C. Arnett to be postmaster at Anton, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

James L. Hunter to be postmaster at Austin, Tex., in place of J. L. Hunter. Incumbent's commission expired May 28, 1930.

Alice S. Cummings to be postmaster at Balmorhea, Tex., in place of M. C. Lucky. Incumbent's commission expired December 17, 1929.

Charles J. Steves to be postmaster at Bay City, Tex., in place of T. H. Castleton, deceased.

Walter E. Holloway to be postmaster at Detroit, Tex., in place of Bertie Freeman. Incumbent's commission expired May 12, 1930.

Robert C. Carmack to be postmaster at Farmersville, Tex., in place of Hugo Simon, deceased.

Kipling E. Yates to be postmaster at Forney, Tex., in place of W. S. Yates, deceased.

Henry F. Priesmeyer to be postmaster at Garwood, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Earl D. Tracy to be postmaster at Junction, Tex., in place of E. D. Tracy. Incumbent's commission expired June 8, 1930.

John C. Sanders to be postmaster at McDade, Tex., in place of J. W. Moore, deceased.

Lora Barber to be postmaster at Miami, Tex., in place of Ada Rodgers, deceased.

Loyal N. Tyer to be postmaster at Mont Belvieu, Tex. Office became presidential April 1, 1930.

Edward S. Howe to be postmaster at Neches, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Crecy Longmire to be postmaster at Newgulf, Tex. Office became presidential April 1, 1930.

Joe H. Victory to be postmaster at New Willard, Tex., in place of J. H. Victory. Incumbent's commission expired May 26, 1930.

Jesse R. Thigpen to be postmaster at Omaha, Tex., in place of W. C. Vickers. Incumbent's commission expired May 12, 1930.

Joseph R. Gilliland to be postmaster at Paradise, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Manda Fields to be postmaster at Ponta, Tex., in place of A. R. Redden. Incumbent's commission expired January 13, 1930.

Sidney T. Bogan to be postmaster at Quitaque, Tex., in place of Cletus Dunham, removed.

Duma McDonald to be postmaster at Santo, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

A. Delta Sanders to be postmaster at Scurry, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Stella W. Schultze to be postmaster at Talco, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1929.

John B. Miller to be postmaster at Tyler, Tex., in place of G. E. Longacre, resigned.

Joseph P. Williams to be postmaster at Van, Tex. Office became presidential October 1, 1930.

Julia E. Fones to be postmaster at Village Mills, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Mattie P. Grieve to be postmaster at Walnut Springs, Tex., in place of K. C. Stinebaugh, deceased.

James R. Oliver to be postmaster at Wells, Tex. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

VERMONT

Margaret P. Cullinan to be postmaster at Arlington, Vt., in place of B. L. Hard. Incumbent's commission expired May 26, 1930.

Mary R. Walker to be postmaster at Hartland, Vt. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

VIRGINIA

Thelma A. Best to be postmaster at Bluemont, Va., in place of J. C. Beatty, deceased.

Thomas J. Wilson to be postmaster at Clifton Forge, Va., in place of T. J. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1930.

Harry S. Shuey to be postmaster at Craigsville, Va., in place of H. S. Shuey. Incumbent's commission expired July 2, 1930.

W. Ingles Harnsberger to be postmaster at Grottoes, Va., in place of W. I. Harnsberger. Incumbent's commission expired June 8, 1930.

Charles W. Fuller to be postmaster at Honaker, Va., in place of D. L. Fuller, removed.

Missouri S. Harmon to be postmaster at Melfa, Va., in place of M. S. Harmon. Incumbent's commission expired June 8, 1930.

Frank H. Dame to be postmaster at Newcastle, Va., in place of B. E. Carper, deceased.

James B. Porterfield to be postmaster at Newport, Va., in place of H. Y. Smith, resigned.

Walter C. Franklin to be postmaster at Pamplin, Va., in place of W. C. Franklin. Incumbent's commission expires December 22, 1930.

Preston H. Edwards to be postmaster at Sweet Briar, Va., in place of W. B. Dew, resigned.

Robert W. Harman to be postmaster at Tazewell, Va., in place of W. G. O'Brien. Incumbent's commission expired June 8, 1930.

Charlie R. Fisher to be postmaster at Wytheville, Va., in place of C. R. Fisher. Incumbent's commission expires December 22, 1930.

WASHINGTON

Alvin E. Scott to be postmaster at Benton City, Wash., in place of A. B. Brewster, resigned.

Elizabeth Grant to be postmaster at Delrio, Wash. Office made presidential July 1, 1930.

Lettie M. Madden to be postmaster at Holcomb, Wash. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Phillip Abbey to be postmaster at Hoodspout, Wash. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Roy F. Chatlien to be postmaster at Monitor, Wash. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Charles J. Fredricks to be postmaster at Moxee City, Wash. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Paul H. Sceva to be postmaster at Paradise Inn., Wash. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Alla G. Thomas to be postmaster at Soap Lake, Wash., in place of N. S. Okerberg, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA

Thaw Stewart to be postmaster at Dunbar, W. Va., in place of Thaw Stewart. Incumbent's commission expired June 28, 1930.

Rutherford L. Dowdell to be postmaster at Glen Dale, W. Va., in place of F. V. Chambers, resigned.

Eula Collier to be postmaster at Kermit, W. Va., in place of Albert Kirk, resigned.

Thelma F. Settle to be postmaster at Page, W. Va., in place of R. E. Ingram, removed.

Reece G. Johnson to be postmaster at Twin Branch, W. Va., in place of Edgar Hamby, removed.

WISCONSIN

Dennis D. Shea to be postmaster at Arena, Wis. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

James W. Pryor to be postmaster at Barneveld, Wis., in place of Annie Jordan. Incumbent's commission expired June 19, 1930.

Joseph Wahl to be postmaster at Dallas, Wis., in place of G. C. Grinde, resigned.

Joseph W. Jacobson to be postmaster at Dane, Wis. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Charles C. Randolph to be postmaster at East Troy, Wis., in place of H. B. Linde, removed.

Clayton M. Honeysett to be postmaster at Footville, Wis. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Stephen M. Peeters to be postmaster at Little Chute, Wis., in place of S. M. Peeters. Incumbent's commission expired June 19, 1930.

Clarence A. Loescher to be postmaster at Menasha, Wis., in place of W. H. Pierce. Incumbent's commission expires January 13, 1930.

James E. Brazeau to be postmaster at Nekoosa, Wis., in place of M. G. Helke, deceased.

Wallace M. Comstock to be postmaster at Oconto, Wis., in place of W. M. Comstock. Incumbent's commission expired May 21, 1930.

Albon Parks to be postmaster at Pickett, Wis. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Leo A. Brzezinski to be postmaster at Sobieski, Wis. Office became presidential July 1, 1930.

Raymond E. Lingsweiler to be postmaster at Sturtevant, Wis., in place of J. W. Simmons. Incumbent's commission expired June 19, 1930.

Earl G. Lawsha to be postmaster at Wonewoc, Wis., in place of A. R. White. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1930.

WYOMING

Percy G. Matthews to be postmaster at Evanston, Wyo., in place of P. G. Matthews. Incumbent's commission expires December 21, 1930.

Edna C. Jessen to be postmaster at Newcastle, Wyo., in place of E. C. Jessen. Incumbent's commission expired February 27, 1930.

Harry A. Wylam to be postmaster at Superior, Wyo., in place of L. R. Moore, resigned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1930

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father of Mercies, Thou art love, power, and redemption over all the earth. From eternity and through eternity Thou art God over all. Grant that the glimpses that we have of Thee may be so directed that we shall be inspired to go on to virtue, to fortitude, and to aspiration with the utmost endeavor. Blessed Lord God, by faith, by hope, and by love may we hold fast to Thee and patiently wait for Thy disclosures. While all things are transient and are passing away, yet amid all there is a blossoming in the wilderness, untouched and unsmitten. Strengthen us in all patience and make us fruitful in abundant good works. In the Savior's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, December 12, 1930, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On December 10, 1930:

H. J. Res. 333. Joint resolution to authorize an appropriation of \$10,000 for the expenses of participation by the United States in the Ninth International Dairy Congress, Copenhagen, Denmark, 1931; and

H. R. 13035. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Grand Calumet River at East Chicago, Ind.

On December 11, 1930:

H. R. 7996. An act to change the name of Iowa Circle in the city of Washington to Logan Circle; and

H. R. 10093. An act for the relief of Emmett Brooks.

On December 12, 1930:

H. R. 4050. An act donating trophy gun to F. D. Hubbel Relief Corps No. 103, of Hillsboro, Ill.; and

H. R. 12742. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to adjust the compensation of certain employees in the Customs Service," approved May 29, 1928.

ADDRESS BY HON. HENRY W. TEMPLE, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. CHALMERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order. A few days ago I had an opportunity of reading a very interesting address delivered by our scholarly colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Hon. HENRY W. TEMPLE, on the subject of the national pike. For the past 10 years in driving to and from my district to Washington I have used sections of U. S. 40 in Ohio, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Maryland. U. S. 40 is one of the most picturesque and historic automobile highways in this country. Just before the opening of this session I drove it from Webster Groves, Mo., to Frederick, where I left U. S. 40 and dropped down to the District of Columbia over U. S. 240.

Doctor TEMPLE, in his very interesting historical paper, has treated this highway and its points of interest between Wheeling and Cumberland. As we all know from his record here, the distinguished chairman of our Foreign Affairs Committee would make any paper which he proposed of great historical interest. Doctor TEMPLE, for many years, has been a lecturer and professor in Washington and Jefferson College.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing the address referred to above.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing an address delivered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TEMPLE]. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

The address is as follows:

NATIONAL PIKE

The quality of modern highways and the speed with which we fly along them are among the characteristics of our times. A little more than a hundred years ago Lord Campbell covered the distance between Edinburgh and London, about 400 miles, in three days and three nights. The rate was less than 6 miles an hour, but considering the roads and the means of travel then available the achievement was remarkable. Before he undertook the journey judicious friends warned him against it and assured him that several persons venturesome enough to try it had died from the mere rapidity of the motion.

The roads built by the Roman Government in the days when Rome ruled the world were possibly equal in some respects to the best built now. Some of them are still in use, and their construction is studied by road-building engineers and found interesting for their use of concrete and cut blocks. But from the decay of ancient civilization until our own times road building on a large scale had seldom been attempted. The National Pike was in its day one of the great undertakings of the times. One might almost study the progress of civilization in the United States in the history of this road in its various stages from its beginning to the present day.

We commonly speak of it as the National Pike, but there was a path along that route before there was a nation in the Western Hemisphere. It was made a trade route before there were any white men west of the Appalachian Mountains except a few Indian traders who had established trading posts in the scattered Indian towns, most of which were on the far side of the Ohio River. A few Indians, among them Nemaocolin and our local chief, Tingooqua, had their autumn hunting camps in this region, but their towns were for the most part on the streams that flow into the Ohio from the north side. That was a rich country, judged by the standard of riches that appealed to the fur traders.